

405
M8
v. 14

1477
140

Modern Philology

VOLUME XIV

May 1916

NUMBER I

MORALITY FRAGMENTS FROM NORFOLK¹

In a Commonplace Book compiled by Robert Reynys of Acle, Norfolk, toward the end of the fifteenth century and now preserved in the Bodleian Library (Tanner MS 407), occur two short pieces of verse which are of interest to students of the early English drama. In the account of MS 407 given in the *Catalogue of the Tanner MSS* (Oxford, 1860) these pieces are described as follows:

21. A poem on delight. fol. 43^b.
Begins, "Lo here is a ladde lyght
Al fresch I ȝou plyght."
22. Epilogue to a miracle play. fol. 44^b.
Begins, "Now wursheppful soueryns that syttyn here in syth
Lordys and ladyes and frankelens in fay."

By way of introduction to the text of these poems it will be useful to present first certain biographical data concerning the compiler of the book, gathered from the memoranda relating to business transactions, family history, and parochial activities which are contained in other portions of the manuscript. Acle (or Accle as it is now spelled), the village in which Robert Reynys lived, is situated in eastern Norfolk in the Hundred of South Walsham, and was, according to Blomefield,² a market town.

¹ The materials for this paper were collected by Miss Calderhead some three years ago while she was a member of my Middle English Seminary. Unfortunately she was obliged to interrupt her studies before putting her notes into shape for publication. In the belief that these pieces of verse are too interesting to be allowed to remain unpublished, I have embodied in this paper the materials which she has gathered and for which she is to be given entire credit, though for the form in which they are presented I am wholly responsible.—CARLETON BROWN.

² *Hist. of the Co. of Norfolk*, XI, 93.

Robert Reynys was the son of John and Alice Reynys, to whom ten children were born as follows: John, Robert, Katharine, James, John, Thomas, Margaret, Alice, Margery, and Jane. From the repetition of the name John one may infer that the eldest son died in childhood, so that Robert was the eldest surviving son. The death of Robert's mother is recorded as follows:

[fol. 8a] Obitus Alicie Reynys Anno domini Millesimo CCCC^{mo} Septuagesimo Tercio Et Anno regni regis Edwardi iii^{di}. xii^o. in f^{esto} Sancti Edwardi Regis et martiris cuius Anime propicietur deus. Amen.

Four years later comes the record of his father's death:

[fol. 16b] Obitus Iohannis Reynys Anno domini Millesimo CCCC^{mo} Septuagesimo Septimo Et Anno regni regis Edwardi iii^{di}. xvij^o. xij^{mo} die Mensis Maij in f^{esto} Sanctorum Nerei et Achillei atque pancracij die lune gandowe[?] cuius Anime propicietur Deus. Amen.

The year of Robert Reynys' birth is not given, but may be determined approximately from the date of his marriage, of which he makes record as follows:

[fol. 8a]	ij dayes	In f ^{esto} Sancti Sampsonis episcopi et confessoris [July 28]	die lune
	after S. A.	Robert Reynys maryed Anno	
	[i.e., after St. Anne's day.]	domini Millesimo CCCC ^{mo} Septuagesimo	
		Primo.	

On the fairly probable assumption that he was between twenty-one and twenty-six years of age at the time of his marriage, the date of his birth may be placed between 1445 and 1450. It is odd that in this entry Reynys should omit to mention his wife's name, but elsewhere we learn that it was Emma. According to an entry on fol. 16b, her death occurred May 27, 1479; the names of their children are added as follows: John, John, William, Thomas, and Lewis.

Though Robert Reynys' occupation is nowhere stated, his father was a carpenter,¹ and there is reason to suppose that he followed the same trade himself. At least we find him making a covenant a few days before his father's death for the purchase of his property, including "his place in the Market." This document is sufficiently interesting to be quoted in full. The list of landed property which

¹ In the list of witnesses (fol. 49) to the purchase by Robert Reynys of certain lands and tenements from "Cecille Grene Wedowe" in 1469 the name of "John Reynys Carpenter" stands first among the laymen.

it contains would indicate that John Reynys was fairly well to do for a person of the artisan class.

[fol. 50b] Memorandum that the First day of May Anno regni regis Edwardi iiiij.th post conquestum xvijth. Robert Reynys of Acle made A Covenaut with his Fader Iohn Reynys be his lyue And bowte of hym his place in the Market with the gardeynys and Closse; as it lyeth conteynyth ij rodys with j d. of Rent be yeer takyng of Iohn Tynwhyte for the lane that goyth owte his place to Rekyslane conteyneth j yarde in brede with xvij acres of Ariable lond in dyuers peces clepyd Andrewelond Fre. Also Another Tenement clepyd Baronys with the Closse longyng therto as it lyeth in Kyrgate. Item ij rodys of marsshe clepyd A Stardole as it lyeth in the Marm. Item dim. rod of marsshe clepyd a pytell with wode lyeth at Nethergate. With alle other Comodyes and vayles that to the forseyd place longyth or perteynyth with alle nessarys that ben rote fast and nayle fast lyke as Iohn Reynys held it. For the weche seyd place gardeynys Close; londes tenementes pytell marsshes and Rentes the seyd Robert schall paye or do pay xxxvj li. of lawfull mony of ynglond for hym aftyr his deceasse Acordyng to his wyll as it Apperith in his Testement how it schall be payed And disposyd for hym. of the weche seyd summe the forseyd Robert payed in the seyd first yeer At his dirige and beryng And at his Terment day And for provyng his Testement and for A quetans with other dyuers costes and paymentes as it Apperith in wrytyng x li. Ferthermore the forseyd Robert must paye yearly At the fest of Seynt Iohn Baptist iiij marke tyll the seyd summe of xxxvj li. be full payed and contentyd Acordyng to his wyll. This witnessyth Iohn Hendy of Mowton William Suffolk of Heygham Jamus Reynys Iohn Reynys the yonger and other. 3oven the day and yeer befor specified.

Of all the information concerning Robert Reynys which is to be gleaned from these memoranda the most important item, in its bearing upon the pieces of verse we are about to consider, is the discovery of his official position as one of the wardens of the parish church. As will be seen from the following entries, his father had held the same office before him, so that it came to Robert in a sense by natural succession.

[fol. 16] Iohn Reynys Iohn Goodwyn taylour and Herry Brandon Chirchereves dedyn maken the Batylment of the stepyll weche coste drow to the valow of xvj li. Anno domini Millesimo CCCCth. Septuagesimo ijth.

Iohn Hendy Robert Reynys and William Pey Chirchereves bowte
holl sute
A vestement of Red velvet pouderyd w^t floures of gold complet y^t is [to] seyn A Cope A Chesapyll and ij tonekyllys with Aubis Amys stols and parabys longyng to y^e same y^e was don y^e thur[s]day nest Aftyr alle

Seyntes the pree' of the same vestement is xxij li. y^{ls} don Anno domini Millesimo CCCC^{mo} Septuagesimo quarto [altered from "Secundo"].¹

The simplicity of the social organization in this Norfolk town revealed by these entries is worthy of remark in passing. Of the churchwardens whose names are here set down, one is the carpenter John Reynys, another is "John Goodwyn taylour," and a third—John Hendy—is elsewhere (fol. 40) designated as a smith.

The duties of the fifteenth-century churchwardens included not only the disbursement of sums for parish expenses but also the raising of the necessary funds for this purpose. Various means were resorted to for this end, and among these one of the most popular was the parish play. A considerable proportion of the records of dramatic performances collected by Mr. Chambers² are taken, it will be observed, from churchwardens' account books. In many parishes the churchwardens kept on hand a stock of properties to be used in these performances. And wherever such plays were given it was the churchwardens who looked after the incidental expenses and took charge of the receipts.

The second of the pieces printed below was clearly designed to be spoken as the Epilogue of one of these parish plays. It concludes with an invitation to an "Ale," the proceeds of which were to go to the benefit of "holy chirche." This was a common practice: Bishop Hobhouse, in discussing the financial arrangements of the mediaeval parish, declares that "The Church Ale was, by the end of the 15th Century, the most universal Churchwardens' resort for eliciting the bounty of the parish."³ Accordingly it is an easy matter to understand how a copy of this Epilogue should be found in the Common-place Book of Robert Reynys, churchwarden. For aught we know the proceeds from the very "Ale" which is here proclaimed may have gone toward the purchase of the red vestments for which Reynys and his fellow-wardens in 1474 expended the sum of £23. The *Catalogue of the Tanner MSS* terms this the "Epilogue to a miracle

¹ In Blomefield's account of the parish of Accle one finds both of these expenditures mentioned: "The battlements of the steeple made by the church reves in 1472 cost 16l." (*Hist. of the Co. of Norfolk*, XI, 94). "A whole suit of vestments of red velvet was bought in 1474" (*ibid.*, XI, 95).

² *Mediaeval Stage*, II, App. X.

³ Right Rev. Bp. E. Hobhouse, *Church-Wardens' Accounts of Croscombe, etc.*, Somerset Record Soc., IV (1890), p. xiii.

play," but the text itself hardly warrants such a definite statement. The play which preceded may have been a morality quite as well as a miracle play. Indeed, this detached Epilogue is so general in its terms that it could have been appended to any play given for the sake of raising funds for parish expenses. Possibly it was kept on hand by the churchwardens as a convenient form for use on repeated occasions.

The "poem on delight," which immediately precedes the Epilogue in Reynys' book, is likewise dramatic in character, and appears to be an extract from a morality play. "Delight" announces himself in the typical introductory speech of a morality character:

Wyl ȝe knowe what I hyght
My name seres is delyght.

One may compare for example the words with which Delight's prototype, "Lust and Lykyng," in *Mundus et Infans* introduces himself to the audience:

A ha! now Lust and Lykyng is my name
I am as fresshe as flourys in Maye.

The phrase "Holy quod sche" at the beginning of the second stanza is not altogether clear. The most probable explanation is that the preceding line, "I hope not ful holy," is not a part of the speech of Delight, but was interjected by one of the virtuous characters in the play, who scented danger in the entrance of Delight. Her deprecatory interruption is treated with scorn by Delight: "'Holy,' did she say? No indeed, this does not belong to me but only sport, mirth, and play."

The rest of the lines were spoken by Delight without further interruption. In their spirit and vigor they will bear comparison with any similar passages in the extant moralities. Reynys, we may easily believe, admired the pictorial quality and the swing of this speech, and for this reason copied it in his book. The Epilogue, on the other hand, has no literary merit and probably owes its preservation, as has been suggested above, to practical considerations.

The stanza divisions in the speech of Delight are indicated in the MS by paragraph marks, but two, sometimes three, lines are run together. In printing this text I have divided the lines and have

introduced marks of punctuation. Italics are used in all cases where contractions have been expanded. Reynys uses *y* without distinction for both *y* and *þ*, but I have restored the *þ* wherever it belongs.

I

- [fol. 43b] Lo here is a ladde lyght,
Al fresch I þou plyght,
galant & Ioly.
4 Wyl þe knowe what I hyght?
My name seres is delyght.
I hope not ful holy.

- Holy, quod sche? nay let be!
8 be crist, it acordyth not with me,
but sporte, myrthe and play
me reioyceth for to see;
þe worldes wunderes and vanyte,
12 ther-inne delyght I ay.

- ffor me semet it is to delyght
to be-helde þe firmament lyght,
the cours of sterrys to kenne,
16 The sunne with his bemys bryght,
þe mone how he refulsyth þe nyght,
the planetes in her circumferens renne.

- The skyes in her coloures rake,¹
20 þe therke² sladdes³ of clowdes blake—
this reioyceth me above;
Than of the erthe delyght I take
to see the florente⁴ wodes þer leues shake,
24 the ryveres rennyng by, þer-inne dyuers fysshes move.

- I se these hey hyllys wher is the holsom ayer,
be-nethe the redolent medowes with ther flowres fayer,
þe therke mystes how it ascendys.
28 In the valeys of the cornys ylke ayer,
I se dyuers fowlys to þe wodes repayer—
þer swetly syngang me mekyl a-mendys.

¹ Move rapidly (O.E. *racian*).

² Cf. *Ludus Corent.*, ed. Halliwell, bottom of p. 170: "To marre þow in a thyрке myste."

³ Cf. Gower, *Conf. Am.*, IV, 2727: "And falleth into slades depe."

⁴ The loop at the end of this word is the same as that which elsewhere stands for *-es*.

- I se in these gay gardeynes wher holsum erbys spryng,
 32 þese pereres, þe pomeres, þe venys þat swete frutes brynges,
 the reed rosys and the lelyes whyte.
 I se in þe gret see ther shypys euer seylyng,
 Also how it ebbyt & flowit & fysshes þerin swymmyng—
 36 the whawys how they waltyr, and se the qwall fyght.

- [fol. 44] In þe hore hethys I se the hare sterte,
 the forant¹ dere huntyd, the bukke and the harte
 and the swyfte grefoundes² renne—
 40 The foxe huntyd with howndes in þe gret couerte,
 the swyfte flyght of hawkes, þe fowlys reuerte,
 the fawkoneres rennyng throw thykke & throwe thynne.

- Also I am gretly delyghtand
 44 In fayer courses swyftly renand,
 in harneys gledryng bryght,
 Stately howsys beheldand,
 glased with storys glasand,
 48 pynnakelys ful of fanys³ gloriously dyght.

- Precyos a-ray, that plesyth me gretly,
 the swet musyauns in dyuers melody,
 the cumlynesse of iche creature,
 52 And þe bewte of women specyaly,
 with ther whyte pappys pappyd vp prately—
 þat passeth al other as me semet in sure.

- Me seyng now these solacious sythys,
 56 ther-for in hem al my delyght is
 so souereynlyche a-bouene alle.
 This warlde so preciously pyght is,
 þerinne delyght I with alle myn mythis,
 60 As for wele most speciall.

II

- [fol. 44b] Now wursheppful souereyns þat syttyn here in syth,
 lordys and ladyes and frankelens in fay,
 With alle maner of Abesyans we recomaunde vs ryght
 4 pleasantly to þoure persones that present ben in play.
 And for þoure soferyng sylens that þe han kept þis day,
 in playng of our play with owte ony resystens,

¹ = *farand*, "fine-looking."

² Cf. "grifhounes," *King Alisaunder*, vs. 5284 (MS Laud Misc. 622).

³ Banners.

- Derely we thank þow with myght as we may,
 8 and for þoure laudabyl lystenyng in good audiens
 that we haue had this day.
 And if we haue passyd ony poynt in oure pleyng,
 or moved ony materes in oure seyng
 12 that schuld be to þoure personys displeyng,
 We be-seche þou reporte it not away.

- For trewly oure entent was wel to do,
 and if ony fawte be þer fowndyn it is oure neglygensy
 16 And short tyme avysement causet also,
 for lytell tyme of lernyng we haue had sekerly.
 And euery man is not expert in eloquensy
 to vtteryn his mater gayly on to þoure audiens.
 20 Wherfor we be-seche þou of þoure gret gentry
 the best te reporte of vs in oure absens,
 in euery ilke a place.
 Souereyns alle in same,
 24 þe that arne come to sen oure game,
 we pray þou alle in goddys name
 to drynke ar þe pas.

- For an Ale is here ordeyned be a comely assent
 28 for alle maner of people þat apperyn here þis day,
 Vnto holy chirche to ben in-cressement
 alle that excedith þe costes of oure play.

When the language of these two pieces is compared, certain differences of dialect appear. The forms in the Epilogue, on the one hand, show no variation from the dialect of Reynys himself, as it is exemplified in the personal memoranda in MS Tanner 407. But when one turns to the speech of Delight one notes, mingled with the East Midland forms, certain indications of Northern dialect: (1) present indicative, third person singular, *ascendys*, *amendys*; (2) present indicative, plural, *bryng[es]*;¹ (3) present participle, *delyghtand*, *renand*, *beheldand*, *glasand*, *syngang*(?). So far as the participial forms are concerned, one might regard *-ande* as East Anglian quite as well as Northern.² Frequent instances of participles

¹ Possibly the loop at the end of this word is merely a scribal error for a final *e*, as in the case of "florete" (vs. 23). It is only in this way that this word could be made to rhyme with *spryg*, *seylyng*, and *swymmyng*.

² Thus T. L. K. Oliphant remarks: "In Lincolnshire and East Anglia this [*ende*] was often supplanted by the Danish *ande*" (*Old and Mid. Eng.*, ed. 1878, p. 148; cf. also p. 355).

in *-ande* are to be noted in the Norfolk Gild Documents,¹ for example, *folowande* (p. 15), *brennand* (p. 16), *brennande* (p. 17). The occurrence of *-t* endings in the present, indicative, third person singular (*semet, ebbyt, flowit*) and the single instance of *qu* (< O.E. *hw*) might also be explained on the basis of either Northern or East Anglian dialect.² Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that in the Memoranda these forms do not appear.

Some difference between the forms in the speech of Delight and those of the Reynys Memoranda might perhaps be accounted for by supposing an interval of time rather than a change of dialect. But such an explanation is found to be unsatisfactory when one compares their usage in the matter of final *-n* in the infinitive and the present indicative, plural. In the case of two documents composed within the same district but at different times, the earlier would, of course, show a larger percentage of final *-n*'s. But Delight's speech, in which according to this hypothesis archaisms would be expected, shows not a single instance of final *-n* either in the infinitive or in the present indicative, plural. In the Epilogue, on the other hand, we find: present, indicative, plural, *ben, han, arne, apperyn, sytlyn*; infinitives, *ben, sen, utteryn*. These verb-forms in *-n* are also frequent in the Memoranda. A further indication that this poem was not composed in Norfolk appears in the word *forant* (vs. 38), which is to be identified, I think, with the adjective *farand*, a word of distinctly northern provenance.

But whatever the district in which this poem was composed, the text as we have it shows a decided predominance of East Midland forms. This mixture of dialect, however, is precisely what would be expected in view of the fact that the present fragment was transcribed by a Norfolk man.

IRIS G. CALDERHEAD

¹ Ed. Toulmin Smith, *E.E.T.S.*, Orig. Ser. 40.

² Cf. such East Midland texts as the Brome MS (ed. L. T. Smith, *A Commonplace Book of the XV. Cent.*) and Sloane MS 2593 (ed. T. Wright, *Songs and Carols*, Warton Club).

ANOTHER FORERUNNER OF WarBURTON'S COOK

Professor Baskervill, in *Modern Philology* for May, 1915, suggested the possibility that Warburton in the famous story of his destructive cook was merely appropriating to his own purposes some such anecdote as that provided in the introductory matter to *Naps upon Parnassus* (1658). In a case of this sort, if we are to succeed in relegating Betsy to the limbo of folk-lore, there cannot be too many cooks. Here, then, is another, whose application of literature to life concerned, not pies, but, apparently, the singeing of fowls. In Henry Bold's *Latine Songs, with their English: and Poems* (1685), the occasional omission of the Latin and, in the case of the last two songs, of the English text is accounted for by the poet's father and editor in this way:

Some again were very hardly recovered out of the hands of an illiterate welch Cook wench, who had designed to sacrifice them to the hoary Hen on the Spit, in which service two of these . . . lost all their English Tongue.

HARRY MORGAN AYRES

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK, N.Y.

ANOTHER PARALLEL TO THE MAK STORY

The incident of the passing off of the stolen sheep as Mak's infant son in the Towneley *Secunda Pastorum* has been paralleled by Kölbing from Archie Armstrong's *Aith*, a ballad composed about the beginning of the nineteenth century by John Marriott, and published in Scott's *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, 3d ed., 1806. Kölbing's paper, which first appeared in the *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Literaturgeschichte*, N.F., XI, 137 ff., was afterward rendered into English, and published in the Early English Text Society's edition of the *Towneley Plays* (1897), pp. xxxi-xxxiv. It begins:

So far as I know, nobody has yet discovered that the leading incident in the Second Play of the Shepherds is repeated in quite another department of English literature, viz., in Archie Armstrong's *Aith*, by the Rev. John Marriott, printed in *Minstrelsy of the Scottish Border*, 5th ed.,¹ Vol. III, Edinb., 1821, pp. 481 ff.

After relating the tale in its modern form, and adducing various parallels between Marriott's poem and the play, Kölbing proceeds (p. xxxiv):

The only MS of the *Towneley Plays* seems to have been written in the beginning of the fifteenth century, whilst Archie Armstrong's *Aith*, belonging to the "Imitations of the ancient ballad," was scarcely composed long before 1802, in which year the *Minstrelsy* made its first appearance in the literary world. It is most unlikely that John Marriott—who, according to Allibone's *Dictionary*, was Curate of Broad Clift,² Devon, and Rector of Church Liford,³ Warwickshire, and in 1820⁴ and 1836⁵ published some collections of sermons—borrowed this story from the then unprinted MS of the *Towneley Plays*, and transferred it, of his own authority, to Archie Armstrong, so that the whole of his notes were a forgery. It is much more credible that this funny

¹ The poem was first printed in the 3d edition, III, 460-65, following two others by Marriott, "The Feast of Spurs" and "On a Visit Paid to the Ruins of Melrose Abbey." Marriott (1780-1825) resided at Dalkeith, near Edinburgh, from 1804 to 1808, "and during this period of his life he was on very intimate terms with Sir Walter Scott" (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*).

The footnotes are mine.—A. S. C.

² Clift, 4½ miles northeast of Exeter.

³ Lawford.

⁴ 1818.

⁵ Marriott had died in 1825, but his sons published a volume of his sermons in 1838.

tale was preserved by oral traditions,¹ possibly in a metrical form. The tale was first brought into the Christmas story by the author of the *Towneley Plays*, and afterward, in the seventeenth century, transferred to the famous thief and jester, Archie Armstrong.²

Another parallel presents itself as part of a footnote near the close of William Hutchinson's description of the parish of Bewcastle, in his *History of the County of Cumberland*, 1794, I, 96. Here we have, from the pen of Jonathan Boucher (1738-1804), a friend of Washington's, a sketch of one *Thomas Armstrong*, who must have died not later than 1779, and who is credited with the same device for ridding himself of searching-parties as that described in the *Secunda Pastorum*. Boucher's account is as follows (the *Biographia Cumbrensis*, referred to at the end, was never separately published by Boucher; see *Dict. Nat. Biog.*):

Our plan of noticing not only men of great merit, but also men of eccentric characters, and even notorious malefactors, requires us to record here a remarkable free booter, or land-pirate, of this place, who died about fifteen years ago in Morpeth jail. This man was named *Thomas Armstrong*; but, as is common among vagabonds and thieves, he went by the nick-name of *Socky Tom*. We know not whether such lawless men remained longer in these obscure parts, than in some others: but, some of the feats of this man, who avowedly followed thieving as a trade, are hardly exceeded by the companions of Gil Blas, or by Robin Hood and Little John. Two or three of them we will here set down.

Riding to a fair at Newcastle, he saw an horse tethered in a field adjoining to the road: it was much better than his own; and so he dismounted, and

¹ The note in the *Minstrelsy* (p. 470) says: "The exploit detailed in this ballad has been preserved, with many others of the same kind, by tradition, and is at this time current in Eskdale."

² In the preface to *Archie Armstrong's Banquet of Jests* (Cambridge, 1872), pp. vii-viii, the story takes this turn: "A border sheep-stealer, with the corpus delicti upon his shoulders, was tracked by the minions of justice to a moorland cottage, where they found no one but an apparently 'half-witted' lad vacantly rocking the cradle of some younger relative. The baffled officers were on the point of retiring, when a sudden thought instigated them to turn over the infantile couch, and to their amazement the sleeping innocent turned out to be the missing sheep. The astute but discomfited delinquent was at once seized upon and carried to Jedburgh, where James the Sixth was holding a Justice-aire."

"Condemned to die for his crime, Archie Armstrong—for it was he—pleaded with the King that he was a poor ignorant man, who had but recently heard of the Bible, and who was desirous, for his soul's sake, of reading through the precious volume: would his Majesty's grace be pleased to respite him until he had done this? The good-natured monarch easily acceded to the petition, on which Archie immediately rejoined, with a sly look, 'Then de'll tak' me an' I ever read a word o't as lang as my een are open!' The King was so pleased with the fellow's ready wit, that he forthwith employed him in his service."

put his saddle on it, leaving his own in its place. This horse he sold at the fair to a gentleman, whom, with an appearance of great candour, he thus addressed,—*Sir, this horse is ticklish and troublesome to dress: if you will give me leave, I will shew your servant how to manage him.* The gentleman accepted his offer; and Tom having thus made himself acquainted with the stable, that night again stole the same horse, which he actually left in the tether where he had first found him.

The fellow had much personal courage; as such outlaws often have. On the commission of some daring crime or other, the constables, aided by a party of soldiers from Carlisle, had beset his house; in which there was but one room, serving him for *parlour and kitchen and hall*. Here, to the foot of his bed-post, his horse stood tied: and when the danger became imminent, he mounted this horse, rushed out of the door, and forced his way, in full gallop, through the surrounding crowd, though fired at by several, and his horse wounded by one of them in the thigh.

At another time, having stolen a fat hog, he was pursued by a search warrant. The bailiff and his posse found him rocking a cradle; and he received them with the utmost composure and courtesy. On being informed of their errand, he coolly observed,—*Ay, you are much in the right to search; pray search well, and examine every corner: let me request you only not to make a noise, as the child with which my wife has left me in charge is cross and peevish: I beg you not to awaken it.* The pig was in the cradle.

Many more such feats might be related; which prove only his miserable misapplication of very good parts: the consequence of which was a wretched life and an ignominious death.

The problem presented by Marriott's ballad becomes rather more than less perplexing in the light of this account. On the one hand, can we be sure that Boucher is relating facts, or is he merely recording legends? He would seem dependable enough, if we refer to his biography. He was tutor to Washington's stepson, rector of three successive parishes in the South (1762-75), and ready to forfeit, or at least endanger, his intimate friendship with Washington for the sake of what he deemed the truth. Besides, he was a man of intense affection for his native county of Cumberland, and considered one of the best preachers of his time (*Dict. Nat. Biog.*). What motive could he have had for making mythical statements concerning Thomas Armstrong, who had been dead only fifteen years when he wrote, and who must at least have been sufficiently well known to the officers of the law? If Thomas Armstrong was an actual person, only recently deceased, is it likely that the legendary trait had in so short

a time attached itself to him, unless, indeed, he had merely rehearsed a performance known to him from tradition (Eskdale, the reputed scene of Archie Armstrong's exploit, was, we must remember, not far from Bewcastle)? However, there are difficulties in Boucher's tale. A hog, unless he had been slain, would surely have struggled against imprisonment in the cradle, and would have betrayed his presence by outcries, whereas the Towneley sheep had submitted to have his four feet swaddled (ll. 598-99), since it is clear that he was alive (ll. 323-25; cf. ll. 432-33). But perhaps Boucher understood "hog" in the wrong sense (cf. his "pig," at the end of the paragraph), whereas in the play it meant "young sheep": ll. 456-57 are:

And of xv. hogys
ffond I bot oone ewe.

The tale may have been told of Thomas Armstrong and a *hogg*, as the word is often spelled (cf. Hogg, the Ettrick Shepherd); in which case it is quite as credible of Armstrong as of Mak.

If we admit that the tale, whether true or false, was currently reported toward the close of the eighteenth century about Thomas Armstrong, would this account for Marriott's knowledge, and enable him to write a ballad which should make *Archie* Armstrong its hero, whether through the invocation of "apt alliteration's artful aid"—*Archie Armstrong's Aith*—or as a means of investing the subject with the prestige of relative antiquity? But on this supposition we should still have to account for the verbal correspondences which Kölbing points out (pp. xxxii-xxxiii).

I do not pretend to have solved the problem, which has the following elements, at least. The incident occurs in an early fifteenth-century play (*Towneley Plays*, p. xxvii), in Eskdale tradition as late as the beginning of the nineteenth century, and in what purports to be authentic history of the last half of the eighteenth century. The scenes are laid respectively in Yorkshire, in Eskdale, and in northern Cumberland; Bewcastle¹ and Eskdale are near neighbors, while

¹ For Armstrongs who were notorious thieves at Bewcastle, or in its vicinity, see *Household Books of Lord William Howard* (Surtees Soc., No. 68), pp. 439 (sheep), 440, 443 (sheep), 444, 457, 463-65.

The tracing of stolen animals is illustrated by two stories (pp. 438-39). The first is of John Routledg, balliff of Bewcastle: "The eleventh of Julie 1617, xxxth sheepe being stolen from the Castlesteds neere unto Brampton, of William Heatherington's, weare the next dale followed with a slewe dogg to Kinkerhill in Bewcastle, a tenement

Horbury (*Towneley Plays*, p. xiv) is in Yorkshire, over a hundred miles distant from either in a straight line, and much longer by traveled routes. Did literature convey the incident to oral tradition? Is the incident one which might actually recur in rude times and regions, whether or not assisted by tradition? Or does it merely represent an early folk-tale, which from time to time embodies itself in literature, or attaches itself to some notorious individual?

ALBERT S. COOK

YALE UNIVERSITY

of the said John Routledg, into one of the houses there, where the sheepe were shutt upp and the dore fast pinned. A servant of the said John Routledg was sitting neare to the place where the sheepe were and had bine there from sunerise till three of the clock in the afternoone, that the dogg brought the trod thether, but would not take any notice of the sheepe being there."

The other is of William Taylor, also of Bewcastle: "About the tenth daie of August last, 1617, hee did steale a working ox from John Scott of Nimsclugh in Bewcastle-office, Smith, which the said John, two daies after, enquired for of the wife of the said William Taylor, whoe denied that there was any such ox there, whereuppon the said John Scott being then in William Taylor's yard, went to the bier (byre), and found the same fast sticked, but rushed the same open with his foote, and there found his ox lyeling."

ON TWO OLD PLAYS

Old Custom.—In an "inventory of effects" belonging to the Earl of Warwick, 1545-50, was listed a copy of "a play called Old Custome" (*Hist. MSS. Com.*, II, 102). Recently Professor Feuillerat has published (*Mod. Lang. Rev.*, IX, 94 ff.) from a book of the Revels Office (Loseley MS, 17) what he considers a memorandum of a play to be given at court about 1545-47. The dramatis personae included in the memorandum make it clear, I think, that the play was *Old Custome*, in print about this time. In one column are given the types represented in the characters; in another, inclosed in a single set of large brackets, the names of the personages. The list is as follows: "scoler, vertue zeles; gent, Insolens diligens; preste, Old blynd Custom; prentes of London, Hunger of Knowledge; Colyer, Thomas of Croydon." Professor Feuillerat concludes that one scholar and two gentlemen were represented. Diligens, however, might well be the name of Insolens posing as a virtuous character, a situation frequent in the moralities, while Vertue and Zele indicate two different virtuous characters. The play must have prompted the title of *New Custom*, commonly assigned to the reign of Edward VI, and was probably a forerunner of the numerous collier plays.

A Fig for a Spaniard.—In the preface to *The Spaniards Monarchie, and Leaguers Olygarchie* "by Signor Vasco Figveiro . . Englished by H. O.," 1592, is the statement, "albeit it hath no title fetched from the Bull within bishopsgate, as a figge for a Spaniard, yet doth it discouer so succinctly and briefly, a Spanish imitatio of Machiauellized axioms that what other volumes at large, this in a leafe doth plainly demonstrate" (Brydges, *British Bibliographer*, II, 431). Henslowe records the payment of three pounds "at the apoyntment of E Alleyn the 6 of Janewary 1601 [2] in parte payment of a Boocke called the spaneshe fygge." This entry very probably concerns either the old play mentioned in *The Spaniards Monarchie* or a revision of it. Fleay identifies *The spaneshe fygge* with *The Noble Spanish Soldier*, printed in 1634 (*Drama*, I, 128), and Greg is inclined to agree with him (*Henslowe's Diary*, II, 220). Is *The Noble Spanish Soldier*, then, to be referred back to a play as early as 1592? Few passages in the late play suggest an origin before 1600, though this fact may be due to repeated revision.

C. R. BASKERVILL

THE 1640 TEXT OF SHAKESPEARE'S SONNETS

In 1640, as is well known, John Benson of St. Dunstan's Churchyard issued a volume called *Poems: Written by Wil. Shake-speare, Gent.*, which contained—together with many other pieces—most of the Sonnets of Shakespeare as they had been collected in 1609, and is therefore sometimes carelessly spoken of as the second edition of the Sonnets. This volume has usually been discussed in connection with the question of the arrangement of the Sonnets, since the entirely different order from that of 1609 furnishes some evidence that by 1640 there was no tradition of a continuous sequence. But it has been very little considered with reference to the problem of its text, possible sources, and inferential significance. Almost the only exception to this statement is the account given by Sir Sidney Lee in his introduction to the Clarendon Press facsimile edition of the Sonnets (1905), where he speaks of the 1640 collection as follows:

Benson's text seems based on some amateur collection of pieces of manuscript poetry, which had been in private circulation. His preface implies that the sonnets and poems in his collection were not among those which he knew Shakespeare to have "avouched" (i.e., publicly acknowledged) in his lifetime.¹ . . . The theory that the publisher Benson sought his copy elsewhere than in Thorpe's treasury is supported by other considerations. Sonnets 138 and 144, which take the thirty-first and thirty-second places respectively in Benson's volume, ignore Thorpe's text, and follow that of Jaggard's *Passionate Pilgrim* (1599 or 1612).² The omission of eight sonnets tells the same tale. . . . It is difficult to account for [their exclusion] except on the assumption that Benson's compiler had not discovered them.³

Now if this is true it is of more importance than Lee points out. That in 1640 a practically complete collection of the Sonnets should be in existence in manuscript, different in order from that of 1609,

¹ Lee also observes that Warren's commendatory verses, at the beginning of the volume, imply that the reader will make the acquaintance of the poems for the first time.

² Though I have not had an opportunity to examine the 1612 edition of the *Pilgrim*, I have ascertained, by comparing Lee's account of it (Introduction to the reprint of 1905) with the Benson text, that the latter was printed from the second edition, that of 1612—as we should have guessed would be the case.

³ Pp. 57-58.

yet giving substantially the same text, would in itself be a circumstance of great interest, suggesting a number of curious questions. What could have been the original source of such a text? Is it possible that its text and its order are at least as authentic as those of the manuscript used by Thorpe in 1609? Does the absence of certain sonnets suggest the possibility that they were originally written at a different time, or addressed to different persons, from the rest? Such matters would have to be subjected to the most careful scrutiny. If, on the other hand, the sonnets in Benson's collection should appear to have been printed from the Quarto of 1609, as certain of the other poems appear to have been printed from *The Passionate Pilgrim* and other miscellanies, all these problems disappear.

It will first be necessary to outline the arrangement of the Poems of 1640, or at least that of the first part of the volume, which includes the Sonnets. The following numbers refer to the usual numbering, that of 1609, and the single numbers or groups which are separated by semicolons are those which Benson's editor grouped by themselves and provided with distinct titles. The Roman numerals in parentheses refer to the poems of the *Passionate Pilgrim* collection.¹ 67-69; 60, 63-66; 53-54; 57, 58; 59; 1-3; 13-15; 16, 17; 7; 4-6; 8-12; 138; 144; (III); 21; 23; 22; (IV); (V); 20; 27-29; (VI); (VII); 30-32; (VIII); (IX); 38-40; 41, 42; (XI); (XII); (XIII); 44, 45; (X); 33-35; 36, 37; (XIV); 24; 25; 26; 50, 51; 46, 47; 48; 49; (XV); (XVI); (XVII); (XVIII); 62; 55; 52; 61; 71, 72, 74; 70; 80, 81; 116; 82-85; 86, 87; (XX); 88-91; 92-95; 97-99; 100, 101; 104-6; 102, 103; 109, 110; 111, 112; 113-15; 117-19; 120; 121; 122; 123; 124; 125; 128; 129; 127; 130-32; 133, 134; 135, 136; 137, 139, 140; 141, 142; 143; 145; 146; 147; 148-50; 78-79; 73, 77; 107, 108; 151, 152;² 153, 154.

The first thing that strikes the reader in a survey of this arrangement is the extent to which the order of the Sonnets of 1609 is preserved, despite the alterations. Inside the separately titled groups it

¹ According to the correct numbering, amounting to twenty poems in all. Many editions, through a mistaken division of the 14th poem ("Good-night, good rest") into two, number poems 15-20 as 16-21.

² Here, before the final pair of sonnets on Cupid's brand, is inserted the "Tale of Cephalus and Procris."

is almost never changed, and in the latter half of the collection it is followed as a whole, with a few notable exceptions. That is, it represents such an arrangement as could never have been arrived at fortuitously, unconnected with either the Quarto of 1609 or the manuscript on which that Quarto was based. Or, to put the matter a little differently,—if an editor had all the sonnets before him, not numbered or arranged as in the Quarto, and proceeded to group them freely in twos, threes, and longer series, with a view to giving them new titles, it is inconceivable that he should arrange them in the sequences 67-68-69, 13-14-15, 8-9-10-11-12, 27-28-29, and the like—that is, in the same order (as far as it goes) as that of the Quarto. And the same thing is true if we think, not of a publisher's redactor, but of a private collector arranging the sonnets in a commonplace book. Benson's compiler, then, had before him either the 1609 Quarto or a copy of the manuscript from which it was printed. In view of the improbability of the contents of the Quarto being copied and preserved substantially entire, it is far more natural to assume that it was the printed volume which he had, unless typographical or other evidence is such that we must attribute the changes found in the text of 1640 to manuscript variation rather than to re-editing and reprinting of the printed page. We have next, then, to notice the exact character of the resemblances and differences between the two texts.

I may anticipate the nature of this evidence by saying that I believe no one could proceed far in the exact collation of the texts without becoming confident that the later was set up directly from the earlier. Despite many differences, the general effect is that of a fairly close following of the spelling, punctuation, and capitalization of 1609. In the whole collection of reprinted sonnets there are but twenty-five words differently capitalized in the two editions,¹

¹ These and other figures are no doubt to be viewed as subject to some correction, for they are based on a collation of the reprint of the 1640 collection made by A. R. Smith in 1885. This, the publisher stated, was "printed letter for letter, line for line, and page for page, as near the original as modern type will permit." I have tested the accuracy of the statement by an examination of the original (the copy in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge) for all textual variants amounting to anything more than matters of spelling and punctuation, and in a number of cases for the latter also. A few errors in the reprint have been discovered, but there appears to be no possibility of the existence of any such number of them as to impair conclusions based on the figures here given.

—and readers familiar with the Sonnets Quarto will recall that the capitalization of its text is not characterized by extraordinary uniformity or reasonableness. With italicized words the case is still more striking; there are thirty-three of these, so printed—in several cases—for no reason which criticism has been able to discern, and in every case the 1640 text is identical with the earlier. In punctuation the changes, whether due to carelessness or to intended correction, are naturally more numerous; I have counted some 144 instances, found in 89 sonnets, all told. Roughly estimating that the whole text of the sonnets included in the volume contains something between 2,700 and 2,800 marks of punctuation, one may say that of twenty such marks nineteen are identical in the two texts; and some 55 sonnets show no variation in a jot or tittle.¹ Those acquainted with the habits of seventeenth-century penmen will best judge how far it is possible to conceive of this degree of accuracy having been maintained by copies into manuscript books of any kind. Finally, some 620 words are differently spelled in the two versions, out of a possible total of something like 18,000; but I place no stress on this proportion, since it is obvious that we cannot say with any accuracy in how large a number of the words there was any natural liability to error or change.

The typographical likeness of the two texts may be further illustrated by noting such facts as these: that in Sonnet 1 the Benson version is identical with that of the Quarto—every detail of spelling, punctuation, and capitalization considered—with the exception of the variant "Feedst" for "Feed'st"; that the same is true of Sonnet 8, with the exception of "receiv'st" for "receau'st"; that it is true of Sonnet 44, except for the change of "heaueie" to "heavy"; of 48, except for "un-used" and "unused"; and so on. To the same effect is the evidence drawn from observing the repetition of certain oddities or errors in the Quarto text. Of course if these errors are such as to leave the lines in question with an appearance of correctness, their repetition may be due to any kind or amount of reproduction; but if they are distinctively typographical, and of a character to imply the carelessly mechanical copying of the 1609 text, they become

¹ All these computations refer to a total of 144 sonnets, eight of the 154 having been omitted in the 1640 collection, and two of them having been printed (as observed by Lee in the passage quoted above) from the *Passionate Pilgrim* version.

significant. Such, it would seem, are matters like these: the odd spelling "leav's" ("lustie leav's quite gon") in 5, 7; the spelling "were" (for "wear") in 15, 8; the mistaken placing of the apostrophe in "ti's" in 24, 3; the singular form of "monument" (despite the guiding rhyme "contents") in 55, 1; the transposition of letters in "emnity," 55, 9; the unintelligible misreading "Our" for "One" in 99, 9; the misprint "wish" (for "with") in 111, 1; the misreading of "lack" for "latch," again despite the rhyme, in 113, 6; the blunders "Made" for "Mad" and "proud and" for "prov'd a" (according to the accepted emendation) in 129, 9-11. These by no means exhaust the list. A somewhat different bit of evidence is afforded by Sonnet 101. As we shall see a little later, Benson's editor or printer undertook to change this sonnet so as to make it read as if referring to a woman, altering l. 11 ("To make him much out-live a gilded tombe") and l. 14 ("To make him seeme long hence as he shoves now") to "make *her*" and "*she* shoves." Through negligence, however, in l. 9 he omitted to change "he needs no praise," and so left this reminiscence of the Quarto text. Finally, for these typographical accidents, I may note the trifling but significant appearance of the capital *L* in "O Least the world," at the opening of Sonnet 72. In the Quarto the second letter of each first line is a capital, following the ornamental initial, and in the 1640 volume the same practice is followed when the sonnet stands by itself or begins a group, but not otherwise. In Sonnet 72, despite the fact that in the later version the sonnet is placed second in its group, the printer seems carelessly to have followed his copy.

Further details would be wearisome. Enough has been said to indicate that to suppose the 1640 text to be based on fugitive manuscript collections is quite impossible; and that, if we substitute for this the notion of an exceedingly accurate copy of the Quarto or its manuscript source, the typographical resemblances between the printed versions are still such as to make the view that Benson's printer can have followed the manuscript copy a violation of all the laws of chance.

What can we say, then, of the two specific proofs which Sir Sidney Lee adduces for his view that the Benson text was not based on that of 1609—namely, that eight of the sonnets in the latter were

omitted by Benson, and that he printed Sonnets 138 and 144, not from the Quarto, but from the *Passionate Pilgrim* collection? I may as well admit at once that no wholly satisfactory explanation of the first point has occurred to me, though I shall make some effort to consider it, a little later, in connection with the problem of how the 1640 arrangement of the Sonnets was made up. For the present I remark only (1) that the evidence for the printing of the second volume from the first is so unmistakable that the subsidiary question of the eight omitted sonnets cannot affect the main matter, and (2) that this puzzling question is not much less puzzling in case of the manuscript theory. No matter where Benson's text came from, the fact that it contains all the Sonnets of 1609 save eight, unless those are of a character to give some indication as to why they were omitted, is remarkable.

As to the other point, the text of Sonnets 138 and 144, it is very easily disposed of. These two sonnets were, in fact, the opening poems in the *Passionate Pilgrim* volume; and a glance at the outline of contents of Benson's volume, as given above, will show that, after setting up thirty of the sonnets from the Quarto, his printer turned to the *Pilgrim* and set up the first three poems it contained. He then turned back to the Quarto, set up three more sonnets, and returned to the *Pilgrim* for the next two; and so on, at irregular intervals.¹ He had no thought, then, of the poems which we call Sonnets 138 and 144 as being from the collection of Sonnets. Later, near the end of his task, when he came to them in his copy of the Quarto, he omitted them because they had already—in substance—been used. Or, as is perhaps likelier, the person who outlined the new arrangement and indicated titles for the sonnets crossed out the two in question as known to be among those chosen from the *Passionate Pilgrim*. Their appearance, therefore, in a different text from that of 1609 has no bearing at all on the question of Benson's copy for the rest of the sonnets.

¹ It will be noted that the *Passionate Pilgrim* order was followed throughout, except that No. X was omitted from its proper place and inserted after XIII, and that XIX was omitted altogether. The latter circumstance is readily explained by the fact that Benson's editor knew of a fuller version of the poem (Marlowe's "Live with me and be my love") in *England's Helicon*, which he later introduced into the collection. The former was probably due to the printer's turning over two leaves when he set up No. XI, and later going back for the omitted poem.

Thus far I have said nothing regarding those differences in the two texts of the Sonnets which amount to more than typographical details and which would therefore be of chief interest if we should regard the 1640 volume as deserving the name of a separate text. These must now be noticed, with a view to estimating their significance. Though it has become clear that Benson's printer used the text of 1609 for the actual setting up of the new volume, it is within the limits of possibility that there was another copy of the Sonnets, in manuscript, which guided him in forming a new arrangement and furnished him some new readings. We ought therefore to inquire whether there appear changes in the text which cannot well be attributed to the process of reprinting.

To this end I shall give a list of the variant readings of the 1640 text, classified—for convenience—according as they may be regarded as corrections of errors in the Quarto, or as new errors made by Benson (or his source). In some cases, of course, there may be a difference of opinion as to which group a given reading belongs in; but these are few. In these lists the Quarto (1609) readings stand first.

CORRECTIONS OF ERRORS IN THE QUARTO

6, 4	beautits	beauties	91, 9	bitter	better
13, 7	You selfe	Your selfe	98, 11	weare	were
47, 11	nor	not	127, 2	weare	were
50, 6	duly	dully	128, 14	their	thy
68, 7	second	second	132, 2	torment	torments
69, 14	solye	soyle ¹	140, 5	weare	were
70, 1	are	art	147, 12	randon	randome
73, 4	m'wd	ruin'd	153, 8	strang	strange
88, 1	dispose	dispos'd	153, 14	eye	eyes
90, 11	stall	shall			

NEW ERRORS OF 1640

3, 3	repaire	repaine	22, 2	are	art
3, 12	goulden	goulded	28, 5	ethers	others
3, 13	remembred	remember	37, 11	am	an
7, 9	car	care	41, 2	some-time	sometimes
13, 13	deare	dare	54, 9	is	in
20, 9	wert	went	54, 10	vnwoo'd	unmoov'd
21, 6	earth	eatth	55, 12	weare	were

¹ Malone's correction to "solve" is preferred by the greater number of modern editors.

59, 8	minde	mine	104, 14	beauties	beatties
65, 5	hunny	hungry	108, 5	sweet boy	sweet-love
70, 13	maskt	maske	108, 10	iniury	injuries
73, 5	twi-light	twi-lights	111, 2	harmfull	harmeslesse
77, 6	thee	the.	114, 10	kingly	kindly
83, 9	for	of	117, 9	errors	errour
84, 2	are	art	118, 5	nere	neare
84, 11	wit	writ	119, 13	rebukt	rebuke
84, 12	stile	still	129, 14	heaven	haven
88, 3	my	thy	131, 1	as	a
95, 10	chose	choose	133, 3	alone	along
101, 3	Both	But	134, 14	am I	I am
101, 11	him	her	139, 10	mine	my
101, 14	him	her	142, 1	thy	my
101, 14	he	she	146, 7	inheritors	in heritors
104, 1	friend	love	153, 11	withall	with all
104, 10	pace	place	154, 2	inflaming	in flaming

If we consider the nature of the corrections in the first list, most of them are seen to be such as any reasonably intelligent corrector would perceive the need of and make half-automatically.¹ Two are of some importance—"dully" for "duly" in Sonnet 50, and "ruin'd" for the at first sight puzzling "rn'wd" in 73; for these we should be truly grateful, especially in connection with the magnificent image which the second error threatened to spoil. But even these are such as a corrector might conjecture from the Quarto text itself; and there is not one in the list which implies another text as a necessary source for the correction.

The new errors of 1640 are more difficult to analyze. A considerable number—about twenty, I should say, or a little less than half—are obviously printer's errors, some of them of a wholly insignificant character. Perhaps an equal number suggest a process of unintelligent correction. In 7, 9, for instance, "care" is a possible reading, and was made plausible by the rhyme with the contemporary pronunciation of "are." So in 28, 5, "others" is one possible correction for the plain error of "ethers." In 95, 10, the compositor might well guess that "chose" was intended for the present tense. In

¹ I admit that it is odd that one who exerted himself to do this should have left, so negligently, some of the errors previously noted as reproduced from the Quarto text. But it is obvious that the correction of a typographical error is a matter of no evidential significance for the relation of the texts—it may be accomplished in any one of several ways—whereas the reprinting of such an error is at once a probable indication of source.

111, 2, the context, for a stupid or superficial reader, justifies the change of "harmfull" to "harmelesse," and the same is true of the "my" for "thy" in 142, 1. In 114, 10, the word "kingly" is used somewhat daringly as an adverb, and it was natural, again, for a hasty observer to change to the more commonplace "kindly."

Five of the changes belong in a class by themselves—those which alter the sex of the person addressed, in Sonnets 101, 104, and 108. These might well be attributed to another version, in manuscript, which had been in circulation apart from all contextual allusion to the man or boy addressed in a number of the sonnets; and the more so, perhaps, because the corresponding change is *not* made in the case of other sonnets containing nouns or pronouns of masculine gender. We have already seen some evidence, however, indicating that the changes are due to the editor or corrector,—the unchanged pronoun, for example, in 101, 9. It will be seen by a reference to our table of contents that Benson's editor not only followed Thorpe in putting in the opening pages of the volume the sonnets addressed to a man friend who is urged to marry, but (unlike Thorpe) brought into the opening pages most of the other sonnets plainly having reference to one of the male sex.¹ In the Quarto of 1609, between Sonnets 68 and 101 there is none which cannot be read as referring (or addressed) to a woman, and that Benson's editor so understood the greater number of them his titles abundantly indicate. When, reaching Sonnets 101, 104, and 108, he came upon such disconcerting words as "he" and "boy," he did not scruple to alter them rather than impair the unity of that portion of the collection.

Finally, it is to be admitted that among the new errors of 1640 there are one or two which of themselves would suggest a misreading of manuscript as their cause. The chief instance is "unmoov'd"

¹ These include 54, 57, 63, 67, 68. Sonnets 19 and 126, which are of the same class, were among those omitted from the 1640 volume. There remain Nos. 20 (the "master-mistress" sonnet), 26 (beginning "Lord of my love"), and 41 and 42 (referring to the stealing of the poet's mistress), which we might think would also have been introduced before the 16th page of Benson's text, where the first woman-sonnet was introduced from the *Passionate Pilgrim*. Sonnets 20 and 41 and 42 might have been mistaken, by a hasty reader, for woman-sonnets, but one can hardly suppose this in the case of 26, which occurs on Benson's 38th page. Perhaps, then, the editor did not think of the conventional love-poems as beginning until some point beyond this page. The first sonnet groups entitled as if having reference to women are 80-81, 116, and 82-85 (called "Love-sicke," "The Picture of true love," and "In prayse of his Love"), which occur on the fifty-first and following pages of the text.

for "vnwoo'd" in 54, 10; another is "hungry" for "hunny" in 65, 8. With adequate evidence for the existence of a manuscript as a subsidiary source for this text of the sonnets, we should assume that it furnished the explanation of these readings. As it is we can only say that of themselves they cannot be viewed as sufficient evidence, and that it is possible to explain them, as we have done the others, as due to misreading or blundering correction of the Quarto. Both "unwoo'd" and "honey," like some other altered words that we have noted, are rather unusual or daring adjectives in the places where they stand, and it may be conjectured that a prosaic corrector preferred the familiar terms most closely resembling them. "Unmoov'd," indeed, does not make absolute nonsense of the line, as "hungry" must be admitted to do.¹

On the whole, then, there is little or nothing in the way of new readings in Benson's text to call for the assumption of another source than the Quarto. Most of the alterations are naturally explained, and all can be explained, as due to natural conditions of correcting or reprinting.

There remains the inquiry whether it is possible to account for the arrangement of the sonnets in the 1640 volume, and for the omission of eight of those which were included in the source-text. After a great deal of thinking—and, I might add, reckless imagining—on this subject, I still find myself unable to form any complete picture of the process which was followed in the making of the Benson collection. But some things are fairly obvious, and some others may be conjectured, which I shall set down rather for the gratification of innocent curiosity than because of any important bearing on the question of the text.

In the first place, our 1640 volume is, in a peculiarly definite sense, one of those tasks described by Dr. Johnson as undertaken by those who "lay two books before them out of which they compile a third." This applies literally, if we confine ourselves to the first half of the Poems, which is made from the Sonnets and the *Passionate Pilgrim*; whereas we must recognize more than two books if we include the second half, wherein Benson made use of Heywood's

¹ This error, of course, and perhaps the "unmoov'd" also, may be explained by the familiar process of an error of the ear.

Epistles, of England's Helicon, and various other sources.¹ It would seem to have been the publisher's object to represent this as a new publication (see the remarks of Sir Sidney Lee, quoted at the beginning of this paper), and we may assume that he instructed his compiler to intermingle the materials drawn from different sources, and to rearrange them at the same time in such a way as both to enhance the attractiveness of the book and to conceal its unoriginal character.² Perhaps the first task of the redactor (if I may so dignify him, in the manner of higher critics of Homer or the Pentateuch), on taking up the Sonnets of 1609 as his first principal source, was to furnish titles for the pieces it contained. This would seem to have been done, at any rate, before their rearrangement was undertaken; for if they had been freely shuffled and then furnished with group headings, they could not well have kept the original order, inside the groups, which we have seen is a general characteristic of the 1640 text. We may suppose, then, that in a copy of the Quarto the redactor noted the title "Loves crueltie" for Sonnets 1-3, "Magazine of beautie" for Sonnets 4-6, "Quicke prevention" for Sonnet 7 alone, and "An invitation to Marriage" for Sonnets 8-12, and so on, with continuous titling, until Sonnet 63 was reached. Here the continuous grouping is broken, and, as I conjecture, for some such reason as this: the redactor had given Sonnet 60 the title "Injurious Time," 61 the title "Patiens armatus," and 62 "Sat fuisse." (He was quite right in this, for the three sonnets have no apparent connection.) When he came to 63 he observed that for it and its immediate successors the title "Injurious Time" would again be very appropriate, and therefore indicated, in a note, that these sonnets were to be grouped with 60 under the caption already given it.³ Then he proceeded to entitle 67-69 and 70, and thereafter made another break in continuity, for some reason not so easy to guess. That is, he omitted Sonnet 73 from the natural group 71-74, entitled "A Vale-diction," and marked it to go with 77 instead (with which it has much

¹ For some account of these, see Lee's Introduction to the Sonnets in the Clarendon Press facsimile of 1905.

² For the devious ways of these pirating stationers, see Lee's account of Jaggard in his Introduction to the reprint of *The Passionate Pilgrim*, and, for Benson in particular, Professor W. D. Briggs's account of the makeup of the Jonson Quarto of 1640, in *Anglia*, XXXVIII, 115-17.

³ Making the group consist of 60, 63-66; he might better have stopped with 65.

less to do), under the title "Sunset." I can see no adequate cause for this,¹ and am consoled only by the fact that this is the only case in the whole collection where, within the separate groups of sonnets, the arrangement of the Quarto was changed unreasonably. There is no further break of this kind until we reach Sonnets 128 and 129, which were properly omitted from the sequence 127, 130-32 (called "In prayse of her beautie though black"), and separately entitled "Upon her playing the virginalls" and "Immoderate Lust." The final instance is the omission of 138 from the sequence 137, 139 and 140, called "His heart wounded by her eye," for the double reason that it interrupted the sequence and had already been reprinted from *The Passionate Pilgrim*.

The groups of sonnets now having been formed and named, instructions were probably given for printing without reference to the existing order of the groups; on the contrary, the Quarto arrangement was to be distorted, as we have guessed, for the very reason that the new collection was to look different from the old. "Print a few groups from the Sonnets Quarto, then two or three selections from the *Pilgrim*; then return to the Sonnets for more, and so proceed." Something of this sort we may suppose to have been the printer's instructions. But we cannot suppress a desire to know why he should have plunged into the middle of the Quarto and begun with the inconspicuous group 67-69. To be sure, its title, "The glory of beautie," is a promising one for the opening of the anthology. Is any other reason discoverable? Only, so far as I see, what has already appeared. These readers of 1640 understood the great part of the Sonnets to have to do with a woman or women; on the other hand, some of them were clearly concerned with a man; let these be got out of the way at the beginning.² Perhaps it was to avoid ambiguity in this regard that there was set at the very beginning a sonnet whose first line determines the sex of the person addressed: "Ah, wherefore with infection should *he* live?"

¹ Perhaps it is not the "redactor" who is to be held responsible, but merely the printer, who may have skipped 73 by mistake, and done the best he could with it later.

² Just the opposite process, it will be observed, from that which seems to have been followed by Thorpe or his editor, in 1609, when all the sonnets obviously not addressed to a male friend were gathered at the end of the collection. I do not know why Benson's order should include Sonnets 57-59 in the opening pages; in at least one sonnet of all the other groups there is no room for doubt as to the sex. (Could "sovereign," in 57, have suggested a man? Perhaps so, by 1640.)

But what, in this process, became of Sonnets 18 and 19? We may infer that they had been entitled as a pair, like 13-15 and 16-17; and though they do not, like their predecessors, have to do with the theme of marriage or procreation, they belong with them as clearly addressed to a man. The absence of any internal reason for their omission suggests that, to further the new arrangement, a couple of copies of the Quarto had been clipped, and the sonnets intended for the several groups pinned or pasted together. In that case 18 and 19 may have been lost. Another pair, 75 and 76, seems to have disappeared in like manner, together with four single sonnets, 43, 56, 96, and 126. The last-named, however, may have been omitted intentionally, as it is the twelve-line poem (often, though wholly without warrant, called the "envoy") which the printer of the Quarto had marked as incomplete by inserting parentheses where he supposed the last two lines were missing; Benson's compiler may therefore have crossed it off, possibly hoping to find a fuller version as he did for the incomplete Marlowe poem in *The Passionate Pilgrim*.¹ If, indeed, he was really disposed to be critical in such matters, we may also see a reason for the omission of 96; for this is the sonnet whose final couplet is repeated from that of 36, and may therefore again have seemed to be an imperfect copy. This conjecture, that Sonnets 96 and 126 were excluded intentionally rather than by accident, seems to be confirmed by the fact that the sonnets numbered from 88 to 150 show no such general disarrangement as those in the earlier part of the Quarto text. In other words, after the last insertion had been made from *The Passionate Pilgrim*, following Sonnets 86 and 87, the compiler seems to have wearied of the process of rearrangement, and to have resolved to proceed by the straightest road toward the end. Indeed we need not suppose that the latter portion of the Quarto was cut up for rearranging at all.²

Another hypothesis³ deserves consideration, as a means of avoiding the notion that any portion of the Quarto copy was clipped for reprinting; namely, that the omitted sonnets had been marked by

¹ See p. 22, note 1, above.

² The irregularities in this portion are (1) the transposition of 102-3 with 104-6, (2) the deferring of 107 and 108 to a place near the end of the series, and (3) the omission of 116 as having been introduced earlier, between 81 and 82.

³ I am indebted for it to Professor W. D. Briggs.

a note indicating that they were to be grouped with others later in the volume (as we have seen appears to have been done with 60, 127, and a few others), and that the printer, through lack of a corresponding note reminding him of the point from which he should go back for the deferred poems, failed to do so and lost them altogether. In itself this is not unnatural, but one or two considerations seem to make against it. One is the loss of Sonnets 18 and 19, which ought to have come into the opening section, close to their original context. Another is the fact that the appearance, near the end of Benson's text, of Sonnets 78 and 79, 73, 77, and 107 and 108 suggests that the printer *did* go back at that point, and pick up whatever had been omitted.

The precise character, then, of the methods followed in the making of the Benson text from that of 1609 remains undisclosed. I am not without hope that some reader of this paper may be more fortunate than I in explaining just what happened to cause the loss of the sonnets which did not reappear in 1640. But this is a question which we have seen to be one of curiosity rather than of serious import, at least so far as the matter of the text is concerned. It has proved possible to determine that the text of 1640 has no independent value, and to see somewhat more than has hitherto been observed of the process by which it was made.

RAYMOND MACDONALD ALDEN

LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR UNIVERSITY

SPENSER AND THE SPIRIT OF PURITANISM

It is the aim of this paper to determine Spenser's relation to the inner and essential spirit of Puritanism, its animating life-principle, as distinguished from its theological beliefs and its ecclesiastical program.¹

Stripped of all accidents, what was Puritanism? In his excellent monograph on *The Controversy between the Puritans and the Stage*, Professor E. N. S. Thompson defines it as that "which seeks to obtain the fullest possible conception of the divine idea in the world, and to make that idea rule," as "the effort to rid life, or some phases of it, of the evils that have enwrapped it." If this definition be valid, everyone who has earnestly sought to understand the divine idea in the world and to make it prevail, everyone who has endeavored to rid life of evil, is a Puritan, and the measure of his Puritanism is his devotion to such a program. We must therefore number among the Puritans, Pope Gregory, Bede and Anselm, Dante, Herbert, Newman, Browning, Arnold, Chesterton, Shaw, and Mrs. Eddy, as well as Cartwright, Baxter, Bunyan, and Cromwell. Thus to define Puritanism is to rid the term of all historical significance.

According to Dr. John Brown, the author of *The English Puritans*, a recent volume in the Cambridge manuals,

The fundamental idea of Puritanism in all its manifestations was the supreme authority of Scripture brought to bear upon the conscience, as opposed to an unenlightened reliance on the priesthood and the outward ordinances of the Church. . . . Under all its forms, reverence for Scripture, and for the sovereign majesty of God, a severe morality, popular sympathies, and a fervent attachment to the cause of civil freedom have been the signs and tokens of the puritan spirit.

Now this definition would exclude from the ranks of the Puritans the very men who first bore the epithet of "puritan," for the Elizabethan Presbyterians could never be accused of "popular sympathies

¹ These aspects of Puritanism have been discussed in other papers: *The Political and Ecclesiastical Allegory of the "Faerie Queene,"* Boston, 1912; "Spenser's Arraignment of the Anabaptists," *Jour. Eng. and Germ. Phil.*, XII, 434; "Spenser's Fowre Hymnes," *ibid.*, XIII, 418; "Spenser and the Puritan Propaganda," *Mod. Phil.*, XI, 85; "Spenser and the Theology of Calvin," *ibid.*, XII, 1.

and a fervent attachment to the cause of civil freedom." Indeed, one of the accusations that rankled most in the breast of Cartwright, the leader of this party, was the charge that he sympathized with the Anabaptists, the one sect that had stood frankly for a democratic program. The Presbyterian frowned upon these Anabaptists, and later upon the Separatists, quite as coldly as did the Anglican. It must not be forgotten, then, that these early Presbyterians were not concerned with political reform, and if their successors under James and Charles took a lively interest in such reform, even their altruism did not extend beyond the desire to secure greater liberty for the upper middle class, namely, themselves. To what extent these Presbyterian gentlemen were carried away with "popular sympathies" is sufficiently evident from the conduct of such of their number as sought a new home beyond seas, for did they not arrest the democratic zeal of the Separatist Pilgrims, and did they not drive into the wilderness the very apostles of a true liberty who fled to them for shelter? On the other hand, among the seventeenth-century Puritans must be numbered a great body of republicans, who were fired with the zeal for political liberty, and who were only incidentally concerned with religious reform, if indeed concerned with it at all. Presbyterian and proletarian united in a common cause, yet they were two quite independent elements, as their ultimate disruption proved. No definition of Puritanism is satisfactory, then, that is not comprehensive enough to include such diverse factions as the Presbyterians, the Independents, and the republicans.

The initial impulse of Puritanism was desire for reform in spiritual matters. This reform might be narrowly conceived, to substitute one's own system of church government and discipline for the system in vogue, as in the program of the Presbyterians, or, as in the program of the Brownists and Separatists—the later Independents—it might be conceived as a universal principle, to allow every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, recognizing no other church government than that of voluntary churches, self-governed under Christ and mutually independent. As time went on and it became increasingly evident that reform in spiritual matters was contingent upon reform in government, such reform, hitherto an independent movement confined to a small minority of the socially

discontent, was incorporated into the Puritan platform. This reform, in turn, might be narrowly conceived, to establish the authority of one's own class in place of the traditional authority—in the program of the Presbyterians to substitute Whig authority for Tory authority, or, broadly conceived, to secure the real democratization of government; in the program of the Independents and their political allies, nothing less than to convert England into a republic. It is in the light of these facts that a definition of Puritanism should be framed. Puritanism, then, was the effort to secure reform, either partial or complete, in spiritual or in political matters, or in both.

Because, during the Elizabethan period, the agitation for political change was confined to certain small and very much despised sects, political reform cannot be taken as characteristic of Elizabethan Puritanism. It became a characteristic of Puritanism only in the days of James and Charles. Elizabethan Puritanism was in the main, then, busied with the effort to secure reform in religious matters. Moreover, the dominant party in the movement was the Presbyterian, for the Separatists and Brownists were as yet too few and too uninfluential to have much weight. Consequently the genius of Elizabethan Puritanism was the genius of Presbyterianism, and, because the early Puritanism had thus been captured by Geneva, its program was Calvinistic. In Calvinism, therefore, are found the distinguishing characteristics of Elizabethan Puritanism.

Now these English Calvinists were bent on two reforms: a change in the organization and procedure of the church in conformity with the Presbyterian system, and a reform in the whole attitude of society toward life. The first, already treated in other papers, was largely a matter of externals; the second was the essential reform, for it was aimed at the very roots of conduct, and constitutes the very essence of the Elizabethan Puritanism. The attitude toward life that these Puritans sought to inculcate was grounded in the Calvinistic doctrine of the spiritual man and the natural man.

The Calvinist believed that the spiritual man was capable of communion with God, and this communion he passionately desired. Herein he differed not from the Catholic. Calvinist and Catholic alike yearned to know and see God, as the writings of Dante and Bunyan, of Bernard of Clairvaux and Baxter, eloquently testify.

But there was this difference, that the Catholic was willing to recognize and employ intermediary agencies as approaches to God, indeed felt it desirable and in most cases necessary to do so, whereas the Calvinist insisted that this communion should be direct and immediate, and that any intermediary agencies were in reality barriers between the soul and God, alike a hindrance to the soul and an affront to God.

As for the natural man, the Calvinist believed that man is by nature impure and unholy, and that the senses are, and must continue to be, at enmity with God's purposes; that the flesh was present as a dreadful menace, and that unconverted man was odious in God's sight. The Catholic, on the other hand, believed that in the natural man good and evil were blended, and that the office of religion was to quicken the natural conscience and discipline the natural will. He believed that the body and the mind were God's gifts, and that the pleasures of mind and body, while inferior to those of the soul, and ultimately to be supplanted by them, were not inherently antagonistic to them. Consequently he did not frown upon the pleasures of life but accepted them with a glad heart. He felt that God wished him to live a rich, full-blooded life, enjoying those harmless pleasures which refresh the body and the mind, enjoying beauty of color and form and sound and odor, enjoying the fruits of the earth that make glad the heart of man, and enjoying those superior pleasures of the mind that attend upon the exercise of the intellect. Not only did he believe that the pleasures of the senses were legitimate in themselves, if ever kept subordinate, but that the senses might be the very medium for interpreting the things of the spirit. Hence the physical element was present in almost every appeal that the Catholic church made. Harmonious color, sweet sound, and fragrant odor suggested to the imagination, through the senses, the inscrutable glories of the Unseen. Indeed, the Holy Eucharist itself, the very heart of Catholicism, was a natural blending of the natural and the supernatural, wherein God took advantage of physical means to impart his saving health to a needy humanity.

If an illustration may be borrowed from a modern writer, the essential difference between the attitude of Catholicism and of Calvinism is compressed into the remark that Dr. Lavendar addresses

to Rachael King about her foster-child, in Mrs. Deland's story of *The Child's Mother*: "Well, I suppose it's natural for you, Rachael, to be afraid of the inheritance from her earthly mother, but mind you don't forget her inheritance from her Heavenly Father, my dear." It was this last inheritance that Calvinism was reluctant to recognize.

Such being the genius of Calvinism, it was essentially incompatible with the spirit of the Renaissance. If it had its springs in that desire for spiritual freedom which animated the Reformation, it attempted to realize this at the expense of that liberation of the social, aesthetic, and intellectual faculties which the Renaissance was demanding with equal insistence. If it sought to develop the powers of religion and of conduct, it begrudged a like development to the power of knowledge, to the power of beauty, and to the power of social life and manners. The great problem of the modern era has been to harmonize the spirit of the Reformation and the spirit of the Renaissance, to acknowledge and provide for every man the universal right to self-realization, and to conceive this self-realization as a liberation of all the faculties. Historically, this conception of a harmonious self-realization has preceded the recognition of the right of every man to attain thereto; indeed, this recognition is only partial today, after three centuries of slow change. But this conception of the human spirit as beautifully adjusted to all of the claims of life, this passion for harmonious self-realization, this conception and this passion, it was the problem of Elizabethan England to perceive and to feel. It was perceived and felt by a few rare spirits, perceived and felt by a Sidney and a Hooker—Hooker, of whom Dowden has said with equal justice and eloquence: "The spirit of the Renaissance is brought into harmony by him with the spirit of the Reformation; he is serious, reverent, devout; with seriousness and reverence he does honour to human reason; a grave feeling for beauty models his elaborate periods; he can soar and circle aloft in a wide orbit, yet all the time he remains in living relation with the concrete fact and the realities of human life; he is at once humanist and theologian."¹

To be faithful to all of life—that was the problem of the Elizabethans. This problem Calvinized Puritanism did not understand

¹ *Puritan and Anglican*, p. 69.

or see. In the earlier decades there were many moderate men who espoused the Puritan cause, for, despite the rigidity of the theology that they professed, their practical conduct was tempered by the traditional influence of a sweeter and more Catholic philosophy, but as the theology of Calvin struck deeper root, as its logic became more apparent, accentuated by the growing looseness of English morals, the Puritans became austere, stern, and morose, contracted in sympathies, lacking all sense of proportion, and, equally fatal, all sense of humor. These were the ultimate and logical results of Calvinistic teachings both in Old England and in New England, and Old England and New England only escaped from these results when the vitality of Calvinism had spent itself, and men had reacted to a more Catholic interpretation of life.

The essential spirit of Elizabethan Puritanism, if we may condense all that has been said above, was the attempt to realize fidelity to the things of the spirit through infidelity to all other human faculties.

Such being the essential spirit of Puritanism, to what extent can it be said of Spenser that he was a Puritan? In common with most English churchmen of his generation, he professed the Calvinistic theology; his theological views would have satisfied the most austere Puritan. Did he, however, take the attitude toward the various powers of life that these views logically required? To this question his devotion to the humanistic ideals gives abundant answer. Save when consciously presenting some phase of theology, he advocates and illustrates that full and rich enjoyment of the senses and of the life of the intellect that was the glory of the Renaissance.

He exalts the scholar with a classic faith in the integrity of the intellectual life, calling learning the "girlond of nobilitie," and he exalts arms with the enthusiasm of knight and cavalier. Indeed, it is hard to say whether with Plato he would put the scholar first in society or with Castiglione the statescraftsman; like Aristotle, he wavers between giving highest honor to the leader in state affairs or to the philosopher who, by contemplation, identifies himself with the whole world. If in "The Teares of the Muses" it is said of learning that "men to God thereby are nearest raised," elsewhere sage and warrior are almost invariably associated together as the

noblest products of society. Thus, in the lament of Calliope complaint is made that princes, once the patrons of art,

Have both desire of worthie deeds forlorne,
And name of learning utterly doo scorne,

and in "The Ruines of Time" that, since the death of Sidney,

learning lies unregarded,
And men of armes doo wander unrewarded.

In the "Mother Hubberds Tale" the life of the courtly gentleman is outlined as the beau ideal of conduct, a life conceived largely in the spirit of Castiglione, though more magnanimous, less selfishly calculating, a life devoted to noble activities of the body—the tourney, the chase, wrestling, drawing of the bow, to the sweet delights of music, to the gentle sports of love, to poetry, science, and history. These were occupations requiring a large share of life for proficiency, and not worth the candle if the benefits were but transient. Here there is indeed recognition of the propriety of a full and free enjoyment of the humane activities of body and mind, a generous enthusiasm for Renaissance ideals.

In the *Faerie Queene* the reader moves in a world where delight constantly ministers to the senses—music, painting, gentle landscape, the soft glances and swelling beauty of maidens. It is almost too much of a commonplace to say that Spenser is the very hierophant of beauty.

Nowhere is Spenser's relation to the dominant Renaissance impulses more curiously displayed than in his treatment of chastity. So anxious is he to emphasize the preciousness of this rare virtue that the hero of one book is the knight of chastity, and in other books chastity plays no inconsiderable part. Certainly the lessons of chastity are written large, so that one cannot fail to read them. Britomart, Belpheobe, and Florimel are very paragons of continence. Conversely, the moral decline of one woman, Hellenore, is depicted with dramatic warning: when first seen, a lady of voluptuous beauty who flirts with a strange knight at the table of her lord; when last seen the common stale of the vulgar. And yet, despite all of this labored didacticism, Spenser can present amorous situations with a warmth and a nice eye for effect designed to satisfy the most scrupulous connoisseur in a period when the connoisseur was, to say the

least, exacting. No Renaissance realist could claim an advantage over Spenser's voluptuous picture, in the famous description of the Bower of Bliss, of maidens at the bath. To be sure the placid Palmer, whose blood had been cooled by age, mildly reproves Guyon for gazing with kindling eyes upon a spectacle so tempting, but the poet is careful not to intrude this reproof with unbecoming haste:

And all the margent round about was sett
With shady Laurell trees, thence to defend
The sunny beames which on the billowes bett,
And those that therein bathed mote offend.
As Guyon hapned by the same to wend,
Two naked Damzelles he therein espyde,
Which therein bathing seemed to contend
And wrestle wantonly, ne car'd to hyde
Their dainty partes from vew of any which them eyd.

Sometimes the one would lift the other quight
Above the waters, and then downe againe
Her plong, as over-maystered by might,
Where both awhile would covered remaine,
And each the other from to rise restraine;
The whiles their snowy limbes, as through a vele,
So through the christall waves appeared plaine:
Then suddeinly both would themselves unhele,
And th' amorous sweet spolies to greedy eyes revele.

As that faire Starre, the messenger of morne,
His deawy face out of the sea doth reare;
Or as the Cyprian goddess, newly borne
Of the Ocean's fruitful froth, did first appeare:
Such seemed they, and so their yellow heare
Christalline humor dropped downe apace.
Whom such when Guyon saw, he drew him neare,
And somewhat gan relent his earnest pace;
His stubborne brest gan secret pleasaunce to embrace.

The wanton Maidens, him espying, stood
Gazing awhile at his unwonted guize;
Then th' one her selfe low ducked in the flood,
Abasht that her a straunger did avise;
But thother rather higher did arise,
And her two lilly paps aloft displayed,
And all that might his melting hart entyse

To her delights she unto him bewrayd;
The rest hidd underneath him more desirous made.

With that the other likewise up arose,
And her faire lockes, which formerly were bownd
Up in one knott, she low adowne did lose,
Which flowing low and thick her cloth'd arownd,
And th' yvorie in golden mantle gownd:
So that faire spectacle from him was reft,
Yet that which reft it no lesse faire was fownd.
So hidd in lockes and waves from lookers theft,
Nought but her lovely face she for his looking left.

Withall she laughed, and she blusht withall,
That blushing to her laughter gave more grace,
And laughter to her blushing, as did fall.
Now when they spyde the knight to slacke his pace
Them to behold, and in his sparkling face
The secrete signes of kindled lust appeare,
Their wanton meriments they did encrease,
And to him beckned to approach more neare,
And shewd him many sights that corage cold could reare.

On which when gazing him the Palmer saw,
He much rebukt those wandring eyes of his,
And counseld well him forward thence to draw.¹

In all candor, this passage is done with a relish; done, to be sure, in the refined vein which the Elizabethans so well understood, the vein of Shakspeare in "The Rape of Lucrece," but eminently satisfactory to the exacting gentlemen who made up the society of the court. ✓

Not only is much warmth of fleshly detail introduced into this and like passages where a moral is yet to follow, but such detail is sometimes purely gratuitous. Thus, the description of Diana at her bath is a quite unnecessary prelude to the meeting of Diana and Venus; forsooth Venus might just as well have discovered the round-limbed goddess after her toilet was complete.²

So generously, in fact, could the poet lend himself to the artistic impulse, that he employs stories of rape in a purely decorative spirit, with all of the charming abandon of the classical writers; the moral values quite forgotten in the color and vivacious beauty of the myth.

¹ F. Q. 2. 12. 63-38.

² F. Q. 3. 6. 18.

Such is the story of the parentage of the three brothers, Priamond, Triamond, and Diamond,

Borne of one mother in one happie mold,
Borne at one burden in one happie morne;
Thrice happie mother, and thrice happie morne,
That bore three such, three such not to be fond!

"Thrice happie mother," but, as M. Jusserand has observed with so much naughtiness, "thrice happy father, too," as the story of the conception reveals:

There on a day a noble youthly knight,
Seeking adventures in the salvage wood,
Did by great fortune get of her the sight,
As she sate carelesse by a cristall flood
Combing her golden lockes, as seemed her good;
And unawares upon her laying hold,
That strove in vaine him long to have withstood,
Oppressed her, and there (as it is told)
Got these three lovely babes, that prov'd three champions
bold.¹

Equally irresponsible, and equally diverting, is the story of the parentage of the good Sir Satyrane:

A satyres sonne, yborne in forest wyld,
By straunge adventure as it did betyde,
And there begotten of a Lady myld,
Fayre Themis, the daughter of Labryde;
That was in sacred bandes of wedlocke tyde
To Therion, a loose unruly swayne,
Who had more joy to raunge the forest wyde,
And chase the salvage beast with busie payne,
Than serve his Ladies love, and waste in pleasures vayne.

The forlorne mayd did with loves longing burne,
And could not lacke her lovers company;
But to the woods she goes, to serve her turne,
And seeke her spouse that from her still does fly,
And followes other game and venery:
A Satyre chaunst her wandering for to finde;
And, kindling coles of lust in brutish eye,
The loyall linkes of wedlock did unbinde,
And made her person thrall unto his beastly kind.

F.Q. 4. 2. 41, 45.

So long in secret cabin there he held
 Her captive to his sensuall desyre,
 Till that with timely fruit her belly sweld,
 And bore a boy unto that salvage syre:
 Then home he suffred her for to retyre,
 For ransome leaving him the late-borne childe;
 Whom, till to ryper yeares he gan aspyre,
 He noused up in life and manners wilde,
 Emongst wild beastes and woods, from lawes of men exilde.¹

This conduct apparently merits no disfavor in the poet's eye. Indeed, the domestic situation seems to be regarded as rather felicitous; the son develops no unfortunate hereditary traits, and the parents conspire to raise a model youth, brave, generous, and courteous.

Most engaging of all is the beautiful myth of Chrysogone, who became pregnant of the bright sunbeams as she slept "all naked bare," and bore the chaste Belpheobe and the fair Amorette, "a goodly storie to declare."²

These are very graceful and diverting episodes, but they are not the work of a man who resolutely fled from the gay shows of *Vanity Fair* that he might gain the City Celestial; not the kind of reading that Elder Skelton and Elder Higginson would have chosen to confirm in godliness the select youth of Salem.

In no other poem does Spenser show the true humanitarian that he was more convincingly than in the "Epithalamion," his own marriage ode. Though the poet had then reached the discreet age of forty-two, the coming nuptials, anticipated with that sincerity which does so much honor to the Elizabethans, are awaited with the tingling expectancy of youth, a passage very delicately touched, but withal very intense. The anticipated feasting and merrymaking would have satisfied the gayest of Cavaliers; no Puritan squeamishness is to mar the spirit of these festivities:

Never had man more joyfull day than this,
 Whom heaven would heape with blis;
 Make feast therefore now all this live-long day;
 This day for ever to me holy is.
 Poure out the wine without restraint or stay,

¹ *F.Q.* 1. 6. 21-23.

² *F.Q.* 3. 6.

Poure not by cups, but by the belly full,
 Poure out to all that wull,
 And sprinkle all the postes and wals with wine,
 That they may sweat, and drunken be withall.
 Crowne ye God Bacchus with a coronall,
 And Hymen also crowne with wreathes of vine;
 And let the Graces daunce unto the rest,
 For they can do it best:
 The whiles the maydens doe theyr carroll sing,
 To which the woods shall answer, and theyr eecho ring.
 Ring ye bells, ye yong men of the towne,
 Ring ye the bells, to make it weare away,
 And bonefiers make all day;
 And daunce about them, and about them sing,
 That all the woods may answer, and your eecho ring.

It is not enough for the heart of man to be gladdened with the good red wine; marry, the very walls and posts must drunken be! Forsooth, if Goodman Spenser actually furnished the entertainment anticipated in this ode, it was well for him that his nuptials were consummated in Cork or in Youghall, and not in Salem, Massachusetts.

In matters of moral conduct the great battleground of Elizabethan England was the stage. As early as 1560, William Alley was delivering at St. Paul's, the very heart of ecclesiastical England, lectures against plays and romances, and warning Christians of the danger of thus "saluting Venus." In 1570 Roger Ascham took similar ground in the *Scholemaster*, and censured for their wantonness not only the Latin plays but so goodly a romance as the *Morte D'Arthur*. Two years later, Edward Dering wrote in like vein, deprecating the fondness of the public for "onchast fables, and tragedies and such like sorceries," not even sparing good old Guy of Warwick. In 1577 John Northbrooke brought out his *Treatise*, in which the whole question of amusements was more elaborately considered than heretofore, and this was followed two years later by Gosson's famous work, *The School of Abuse*, the former condemning the stage primarily on religious, the latter on economic, grounds.¹ Opposed to these writers were another group who defended the drama, though not

¹ See. E. N. S. Thompson, *The Controversy between the Puritans and the Stage*, chap. iv.

unmindful of its abuse; Sidney, who wrote in 1583 (?); Webbe, in 1586; Puttenham, in 1586; and Harrington, in 1589. With this group of men who thus took middle ground, Spenser clearly belongs. He himself wrote a defense of poetry, he was the author of several comedies, and he was greatly admired of Dekker and Lodge, themselves defenders of the stage. Though his essay on poetry is lost, its general temper may be gathered from "The Teares of the Muses," a poem in which each of the muses in turn laments the decadency of her own particular art. The poet's attitude toward comedy is here shown to be virtually identical with that of Sidney: comedy should hold the mirror up to nature, and refined play of seemly wit should furnish delight; if laughter be provoked, it should be a laughter that is consistent with such noble pleasure.

All places they with follie have possest,
And with vaine toyes the vulgare entertaine;
But me have banished, with all the rest,
That whilome wont to wait upon my traine,
Fine Counterfesaunce, and unhurtfull Sport,
Delight, and Laughter, deckt in seemly sort.

All these, and all that els the Comick Stage
With seasoned wit and goodly pleasance graced,
By which mans life in his likest image
Was limned forth, are wholly now defaced;
And those sweete wits, which wont the like to frame,
Are now despized, and made a laughing game.¹

In like vein Sidney is very careful to show how delight and laughter may be harmoniously adjusted in comedy:

But our comedians think there is no delight without laughter, which is very wrong; for though laughter may come with delight, yet cometh it not of delight, as though delight should be the cause of laughter; but well may one thing breed both together. Nay, rather in themselves they have, as it were, a kind of contrarity. For delight we scarcely do, but in things that have a conveniency to ourselves, or to the general nature; laughter almost ever cometh of things most disproportioned to ourselves and nature. Delight hath a joy in it either permanent or present; laughter hath only a scornful tickling. . . . Yet deny I not but that they may go well together. For as in Alexander's picture well set out we delight without laughter, and in twenty mad antics we laugh without delight; so in Hercules, painted, with

¹ 93-100.

his great beard and furious countenance, in women's attire, spinning at Omphale's commandment, it breedeth both delight and laughter; for the representing of so strange a power in love procureth delight, and the scornfulness of the action stirreth laughter.¹

Certainly Spenser is not to be associated with those Puritans who condemned stage-plays without discrimination, and even frowned upon those goodly romances of the older days that were very meat and drink to the poet.

But enough of this, which has the wearisomeness of a thrice-told tale. With a scholar's faith in the integrity of the intellectual life, an apostle of beauty, a lover of the good things of life, assuredly Spenser was in the main an admirable exponent of the Renaissance, however contradictory to its spirit his theological professions may have been, and however studiously he may have striven at times to give expression to Calvinistic teachings in his art.

FREDERICK MORGAN PADELFORD

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

¹ Cook's ed., 50-51.

SOME NOTES ON MANKIND

DATE

In my dissertation on *Some English and Latin Sources and Parallels for the Morality of Wisdom*,¹ I pointed out that the probable date of composition of *Mankind* was 1465-74. The earlier limit of this period is determined by the reference in the play to "rede reyallys" (l. 458); gold royals were first coined in England in 1465, and as the first mention of them in the *New English Dictionary* is under the year 1473, it is probable that foreign royals were not much in use before this date. The later limit, 1474, is fixed by the inscription at the end of the play, "O liber, si quis cui constas forte queretur, Hyngham quem monacho dices, super omnia consta[s]." This Monk Hyngham I identified with Richard Hengham (p. 86), who became abbot of St. Edmundsbury Abbey in 1474, and who would, therefore, not designate himself as plain "monk" after that date.

It is now possible, I think, to fix the date more exactly than 1465-74. The heading of the record of the mock court (ll. 680-86) reads:

"Curia tenta generalis,"

In a place þer goode ale ys,

Anno regni regitalis

Edwardi millateni [MS nullateni].

On ȝestern day, in Feuerere, þe ȝere passyth fully.

As Nought hath wrytyn; here ys owur tulli,

Anno regni regis nulli.

This seems to me to point to the period between October, 1470, when Edward IV fled from England, leaving the kingdom in possession of his rival, Henry VI, and April, 1471, when Edward regained the throne. During this time the question of who was king was in debate, and the expressions "Edwardi nullateni" and "anno regni regis nulli" are particularly appropriate.

This period between October and April fits the references to time in the play. Mr. Pollard thinks that the play was "written for performance at Christmas, or at least in the winter"; and for

¹ W. K. Smart, *Some English and Latin Sources for the Morality of Wisdom*, pp. 87 ff., and footnote, p. 89. (Menasha, Wis.: George Banta Publishing Co.)

proof he cites the following passages: Mankind's statement that he will sow his corn "at wyntur" (l. 539); and the allusions to a "wyntur corn-thresher" (l. 54), to the "Crystemes song" (l. 325), to the cold weather (l. 316), and to football (l. 725).¹ If by the phrase "at Christmas, or at least in the winter," Mr. Pollard means "in midwinter" (and that seems to be his implied meaning), his conclusion is not warranted by the evidence in the play, for this evidence points to very late winter or early spring as the time of performance.

Some points not mentioned by Mr. Pollard need first to be examined. In the first place, the incident of digging with a spade and preparing for the sowing of the corn suggests that the play was given in one of the two seasons for breaking the ground and planting the grain—either in the autumn or in the early spring. Of these two, the evidence is all in favor of the spring season, which commonly lasted from Candlemas (February 2) to Easter.² The most definite reference to time in the play is in l. 684: "On ȝestern day, in Feuerere." This expression forms part of the mock heading for the proceedings of the court of Myscheff; but it is reasonable to suppose that the reference is to the current month, rather than to a remote one. Other considerations point to the latter part of this month. Thus, in l. 314, Mankind, after discussing with Mercy the conflict between his body and soul, fortifies himself against the assaults of his enemies by "titling" in his paper the words, "Memento, homo, quod cinis es, & in cinerem reuerteris." This was the central text of the services for Ash Wednesday, being pronounced by the priest at the time of the sprinkling of the ashes; it embodied the thought which the church intended should be carried into Lent.³ The play, of course, was not performed on Ash Wednesday, which was naturally not a day for the giving of plays; but the use of this text suggests a relation with the season just preceding Lent. Moreover, the general tone of *Mankind* is what we would expect in a play given in this time of festivity, which reached its climax in the boisterous gaiety of Shrove Tuesday.⁴ Now, in 1471 this season fell in

¹ *Macro Plays*, Introduction, p. xiii.

² N. J. Hone, *The Manor and Manorial Records*, p. 81.

³ Brand, *Popular Antiquities* (1890), I, 94.

⁴ For a description of the festivities of the pre-Lenten season, and especially of Shrove Tuesday, see Brand, *op. cit.*, I, 64 ff.; R. Chambers, *The Book of Days* (1886), I, 236 ff.; and W. Hone, *The Every Day Book*, I, 123 ff.

the latter part of February, for in that year the date of Shrove Tuesday was February 26; that is, Lent began on February 27. The reference in l. 802 to "sent Daui" is also worth noting. It may be only a coincidence, but St. David's "day" is March 1, which, in 1471, was only three days after Shrove Tuesday.

It remains to see how this time agrees with the allusions which Mr. Pollard cites as pointing to a winter performance. The allusion to football (l. 725) is particularly appropriate for this period. This game was commonly a part of the Shrove Tuesday celebrations;¹ in fact, Shrove Tuesday was sometimes called "Football Day."² Also, the comment on the coldness of the weather (l. 316) is certainly not inappropriate for the last of February in England. Again, when Mysceff says in l. 54 that he has hired out as a "wyntur corn-threscher," he is making a joking allusion to his present idleness—he will work next winter. The point of the joke lies in the fact that it is now *not* winter, that is, midwinter, the season when the threshing was done; and the point is emphasized by postponing for almost a year the time when he will work. Mankind's statement (l. 539) that he will sow his corn "at wyntur" means that he will wait until the fall seeding time; he is disgusted with the difficulties of sowing in the present spring season. Mr. Pollard also suggests this as a possible meaning. Finally, Now-a-days calls his song a "Crystemes songe" (l. 325), not because it was sung at Christmas, but because the name suggested to the audience a common type of song that was very different in subject-matter from the ribald selection in the play and thus emphasized the obscenity of the latter. Thus none of these allusions contradicts our conclusion that the play was intended for performance in the latter part of February, and all but two (those to cold weather and to the Christmas song) are more appropriate for this time than for midwinter. All these facts taken together form a convincing body of evidence in favor of the conclusion that *Mankind* was written for performance in Shrovetide in 1471. The tone of the play is entirely in keeping with the spirit of that season, and moreover we know that plays were sometimes given at that time.³

¹ E. K. Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage*, I, 149-50; R. Chambers, *op. cit.*, I, 237-38.

² W. Hone, *The Every Day Book*, I, 123.

³ Brand, *Popular Antiquities*, I, 65.

MEN NAMED IN THE PLAY

In ll. 498-508 New-gyse, Now-a-days, and Nought, who have been sent out to pillage the neighboring country, name six men whom they will visit, and three whom they will avoid.

Master Alyngton of Botysam.—The most prominent man in this list is "Master Alyngton of Botysam." The Allingtons of Bottisham, Cambridgeshire, were descended from Sir Hildebrand de Alington, under-marshal to William the Conqueror at Hastings; and various succeeding members of the family held positions of prominence in England.¹ One of these was the William Allington who was living in Bottisham at the time of our play.²

The date of his birth is not known; the first notice we have of him is that of his marriage to Joan Ansty, in 1457, recorded in the bishop's register at Ely. From July 4, 1461, to November 18, 1468, he was nine times a member of the commission of the peace (a justice of the peace) for the county.³ As these nine commissions are the only ones recorded in the *Patent Rolls* for this period, he apparently served continuously in this office. His name does not appear on the commission for December 14, 1470, the next one recorded, but he was again a member of the following one, for December 10, 1473.⁴ From July 11, 1461, to October 28, 1473, he was on six commissions of the peace for the town of Cambridge.⁵ William Allington, then, was closely connected with the administration of justice in the county of Cambridge. This explains why Nought, who intends to rob other men, decides to "spare Master Alyngton" (l. 507).

On December 1, 1461, and February 3, 1462, Allington was appointed on commissions to consider a complaint of the prior of Bernewell that the tenants of the manor of Chesterton, county of Cambridge, had thrown off their allegiance.⁶ On June 18, 1461, he,

¹ See the history of the family in Edward Hallstone, *History of the Parish of Bottisham*, in Cambridge Antiquarian Society Publications, Octavo Series, VII, 107-17. The genealogy of the family is also traced in Clutterbuck, *History of Hertfordshire*, II, 539 ff.; in A. R. Maddison, *Lincolnshire Pedigrees*, I, 4; in J. J. Howard, *The Visitation of Suffolke* (for 1561), II, 182; in J. W. Clay, *The Visitation of Cambridge*, pp. 14-17; and in "Sir T. P.," *The Cambridgeshire Visitation* (for 1619), p. 2.

² His biography is given by Hallstone, pp. 111-13; the facts presented in this article are taken from Hallstone's account, except where otherwise indicated.

³ *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1461-67), p. 560; (1467-77), p. 609.

⁴ *Ibid.* (1467-77), p. 609.

⁵ *Ibid.* (1461-67), p. 560; (1467-77), p. 609.

⁶ *Pat. Rolls* (1461-67), p. 68.

with the chancellor of the University of Cambridge, and others, was appointed to inquire into the obstruction of the river which had caused the great bridge of the town of Cambridge to be broken down.¹ On March 12, 1462, he was one of a commission to act upon the release of certain property by one of the Cambridge colleges to a convent.² On March 17, 1468, he, John Allington, and others were appointed to inquire into the escape of prisoners from certain prisons in Cambridgeshire.³ On May 11, 1471, and March 7, 1472, he was a member of commissions of array for the county of Cambridge.⁴

Thus far Allington's activities had been confined to his home county. He had been preparing himself for the higher honors to come. In 1472 he was a member of Parliament from Cambridgeshire, and was elected speaker of the House of Commons. In 1475 he built a chapel at Bottisham, for the welfare of his soul and that of Joan, his wife. In 1476 he was made a knight of the shire. In 1478 he was again a member of Parliament and was again elected speaker. In 1479 he was appointed a member of the Privy Council.⁵ He died in 1479, without issue, and was buried in Bottisham church.⁶

Master Woode of Fullburn.—Burke⁷ says that the family of Wood, which at the time of his writing belonged to Middlesex County, is one of antiquity, and is mentioned in the Court Rolls in the Manor of Fulbourne in 1367. Alexander Wood, of Fulbourne, county of Cambridge, died on December 5, 1479. His son, John Wood, also of Fulbourne, married Elizabeth, widow of Nicholas Hylton, burgess of Cambridge; he died on July 2, 1520. *The Cambridgeshire Visitation* (of 1619), edited by "Sir T. P.," p. 34, also gives a genealogy of the family, beginning with this John Wood.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 133.

² *Ibid.*, p. 177.

³ *Ibid.* (1467-77), p. 101.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 285 and 349. These entries in the *Patent Rolls* do not give the place of residence of the William Allington named; but there can be no doubt that he was the Bottisham man. He was the only William Allington in Cambridgeshire who fits in with the dates. He had no son; William, his father, died in 1459; and William, his nephew, was born about 1449 (he was aged "31 years and upwards" when John Allington, his father, died, in 1480; see Clutterbuck, *History of Hertfordshire*, II, 540), and was therefore not old enough at the time of these entries to have held such responsible positions.

⁵ In 1478, according to *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1476-85), p. 142.

⁶ The facts in this paragraph are from Hallstone, pp. 111-13; I have, however, verified them all from the *Patent Rolls* and other sources. In the *Patent Rolls* there are a number of other references to this William Allington which have not been mentioned in this article. They may be found by consulting the indexes for the volumes between 1461 and 1479.

⁷ B. Burke, *Landed Gentry* (1906), p. 1842.

The Alexander Wood who died in 1479 is probably the man named in *Mankind*. His *inquisition post mortem*, dated 20 Edw. IV, shows that he had considerable property in Cambridgeshire.¹ He was a member of commissions of the peace for the town of Cambridge, appointed in 1471, 1473, and 1475;² and he served on like commissions for the county of Cambridge for 1473, 1475,³ and three for 1479.⁴ In 1473, he was made a member of a commission in the county of Cambridge to inquire into arrears in revenue to the king.⁵ In 1478, he served on two commissions appointed to inquire into the possessions of George, late Duke of Clarence, in Cambridgeshire, and to take them into the king's hands.⁶ On all these commissions, except the commission of the peace for June 4, 1479, he was associated with William Allington.

So far as I have been able to discover, Wood was not a justice of the peace in the spring of 1471, the date of our play; but he was appointed to that position in November of that year, and in the commissions noted above his name is associated with those of such men as William Allington, John Cheney, Thomas Lokton, and John Ansty, all of whom had served as justices of the peace for years before 1471 (see *Pat. Rolls*, index, under these names). This explains the remark of Now-a-days in ll. 504-5 of *Mankind*:

I xall spare master Woode of Fullburn;
he ys a "noli me tangere!"

That is to say, he is a man to be let alone. Wood was too closely associated with the administrators of justice to be preyed upon by one of a band of vagabond players. (Master Alyngton of Botysam, as we have seen, was to be "spared" for the same reason.)

The term "noli me tangere" is applied to Wrath, also a person to be avoided, in Lydgate's *Pilgrimage of the Life of Man*, l. 15607, where Wrath says:

My namē callyd in ech place
Ys thys, "Noli me tangere";

¹ *Calendarium Inquisitionum post Mortem* (1828), IV, 401. Although the Alexander Wood of the inquisition record is not expressly assigned to Fulbourne, he is identified with the subject of our sketch by the facts that both belonged to Cambridgeshire and that the date of the inquisition of one corresponds with the time of the death of the other.

² *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1467-77), p. 609.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.* (1476-85), p. 555.

⁵ *Ibid.* (1467-77), p. 406.

⁶ *Ibid.* (1476-85), pp. 109, 111.

ffor I haue "carmen et ve";
Thys to seyne, (yiff yt be souht)
Be war that thow touche me nouht.

In Gower's *Mirour de l'Omme*, ll. 1515 ff., Arrogance is called "Noli me tangere":

Car il ad celle enfermeté
Que plus s'agregge par toucher;
Et pour cela l'en solt nommer
Le mal *Noli me tangere*.

The origin of the expression is, of course, Christ's admonition to Mary Magdalene when he appears to her after his resurrection (John 20:17).

Pycharde of Trumpyngton.—In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries a family of Pychards lived at Bottisham, Cambridgeshire. In 1279 John Pychard and Geoffrey Pychard held land in Bottisham of the Prior of Anglesey;¹ Richard Pychard held land here of John de Deresle;² and Geoffrey Pychard and Richard Pychard were tenants, in this place, of William de Robercot and Martin de Lada, respectively.³ In 1339 Richard Pychard was a juror in an *inquisition ad quod damnum* held at Bottisham.⁴ In 1341 the name of Richard Pichard appears in an inquisition, held at the same place, concerning taxes.⁵

Concerning this family of Pychards of Bottisham, Mr. Hailstone says that "it is exceedingly probable that they were the ancestors of the family of the same name, who afterwards resided at Trumpington";⁶ but he cites no references to the latter place of a date earlier than the middle of the sixteenth century.

There were, however, Pychards in Trumpington at the time of our play. In the accounts of the Priory of St. Radegund, Cambridgeshire, for 1449–50, appears the name of Johannes Pichard de Trumpyngton;⁷ in the accounts for 1450–51, the name of Pycchard de Trumpington;⁸ and in the accounts for 1481–82, the name of Willelmus Pychard, place of residence not given, but presumably

¹ Edward Hailstone, *History of the Parish of Bottisham*, in *Cambridge Antiquarian Society*, Octavo Series, VII, 233.

² *Ibid.*, p. 138. ³ *Ibid.*, p. 140. ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 264. ⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 273. ⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 130.

⁷ Arthur Gray, *The Priory of Saint Radegund, Cambridge*, in *Cambridge Antiquarian Society*, Octavo Series, 1898, p. 146.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 162.

Trumpington, as in the two preceding entries.¹ This is probably the "William Pychard of Cambridge, 'bocher,' alias of Trompyngton, 'bocher'" who is named in the *Patent Rolls* for 1489.² He or his father is probably the man named in *Mankind*.

Master Huntyngton of Sauston.—The following entries concerning the Huntingtons of Sawston are from *Feudal Aids* (1284–1431); all are for the hundred of Witlesford, in the county of Cambridge.

1302–3 A.D.: "De Radulfo de Huntendone et Dyonia uxore ejus, Reginaldo de Durem et Hawysia uxore ejus pro di. f. in Saustone tento de rege, xx s." (I, 144.)

1346 A.D.: "De Hugone de Huntyngdone pro di. f. in Saustone tento de domino rege, quod quondam Radulphus Huntyngdone et Dionisia uxor ejus, Reginaldus de Durem et Hawisia uxor ejus tenuerunt de domino rege i. c., xx s." (I, 161.)

1428 A.D.: "Walterus Huntyngdone tenet di. f. m. in Saustone, quod Hugo de Huntyngdone quondam tenuit ibidem." (I, 181.)

Here we have three generations of the Huntingtons of Sawston. Unfortunately, I have not had access to the records of *Feudal Aids* for the years following 1428. Walter Huntingdon of the 1428 entry is perhaps the father of the Master Huntington of our play.

These entries prove that we should read "Sauston" instead of "Sanston" in l. 498 of the play. The former was Dr. Brandl's reading, and he was correct in his conjecture that it meant Sawston, Cambridgeshire.³ Dr. Furnivall, reading Sanston, suggested Santon, in Norfolk, as the place intended.⁴

Wyllyham Baker of Waltom.—In the *Calendar of Inquisitions post Mortem* for the reign of Henry VII, are a number of references to a William Baker connected with East Walton, Norfolk, which all the editors agree is the "Waltom" of *Mankind*.

From the inquisition of a William Baker, held on October 30, 1495, we learn that he died on March 12, 1491, and that by his last will he left to his "son and heir," John Baker, the Manor of Nether Halle in Hyllynghon, Norfolk; to his son William he left the messuages of Newgates and Richowdes in *Est Walton*, West Acre, and

¹ Arthur Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 179.

² *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1485–94), p. 274.

³ A. Brandl, *Quellen des weltlichen Dramas in England*, p. xxvi.

⁴ *Macro Plays*, p. 19, n. 3.

Ayleswythorp, Norfolk; and he directed that certain property in Grymston should be sold by his executors for the "benefit of his soul and the soul of Margery his wife."¹

The place of residence of this man is not given; but in the *Visitations of Norfolk*, ed. Walter Rye, p. 11, he is called William Baker of Westthorpe, in Suffolk. According to the latter record, William Baker of Westthorpe married Margery, daughter of —— Hawis; and they had two sons—William Baker of Est Walton, Norfolk, and John Baker of Helington, Norfolk. He is evidently the William Baker of the *Inquisitions* entry, whose wife was named Margery, and who left property in Est Walton to his son William, and property in Hyllington to his son John. The connection of this man with Westthorpe is not clear. The *Inquisitions* record mentions no property in that place. He may have lived there at some time; but however that may be, we know that in 1491 he had property in East Walton.

He is the first member of the family named in the records that I have seen. His son is the first man in the available family history to be called definitely William Baker "of Est Walton." This son, however, cannot be the man referred to in *Mankind*, for his elder brother, John, was aged "30 and more" at the time of the inquisition (1495),² and was therefore only about six years old when the play was written. In the absence of any information about preceding members of the family, we therefore conclude that the William Baker who died in 1491 and who had property in East Walton is probably the "Wyllyham Baker of Walton" named in the play.

The name of William Baker of East Walton appears in three real estate transactions in the *Calendar of Inquisitions* of the reign of Henry VII. Simon Blake, who died in 1489, gave by his will certain property to William Baker of Est Walton.³ Roger Tounshend, who died in 1494, willed to his wife two pieces of land which he had bought of William Baker of Est Walton, "yeoman," and others.⁴ These entries are of such dates that they may refer either to our William Baker or to his son. The first is dated 1489, two years before the

¹ *Cal. Inq.* (Henry VII), I, 437.

² *Ibid.*, 437.

³ *Ibid.*, 225.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 490, 492.

father's death; the second is dated 1494, but we are not told how long before that time the land was bought of Baker.¹

Hamonde of Soffeham.—Dr. Furnivall identifies the Soffeham of l. 508 with Swaffham in Norfolk, situated about fourteen miles from Lynn. There is, however, a Swaffham Bulbek, sometimes called simply Swaffham, in Cambridgeshire, which from its geographical location is just as likely to be the place named in the play. Moreover, in the fifteenth century there were Hamonds in both of these localities.

In the *Patent Rolls* the name of Nicholas Hamond of Swaffham Bulbek, Cambridgeshire, appears in an entry for 1427;² and the name of Nicholas Hamond of Swofham, Cambridgeshire, in one for 1434.³ Again, in 1427 John Vyncent of Swaffham Bulbek, county of Cambridge, was cited for not appearing in court to answer Richard Hamond and William Bocher touching a plea of debt of five marks.⁴ In this entry Richard Hamond is not definitely associated with Swaffham Bulbek; but it is probable that he belonged there, as his debtor was a resident of that place, and there were Hamonds living there at that time.

A family of Hamonds is still (or was in 1906) connected with Swaffham in Norfolk. Burke says: "The family of Hamond is of considerable antiquity in Norfolk, and was settled formerly at South Wootton and Swaffham." The first of the line mentioned by him is Edmund Hamond, who died in 1605.⁵

In the *Black Book of Swaffham*, begun in 1454, among the list of dead benefactors of the church for whom prayers are to be said, is the following entry: "And of Raffe Hamonde, the which did the Cost of Stoling in the Trinity Chapell, and did make the Cofyr that stond in the Vestry to kepe the Tokys and Vestments, and also gaff to the edyfying of the stepyll, xxxiii s. iiii d."⁶ The date of this entry is not certain. It is a part of a paragraph containing the names of a group of men, most of whom gave money for the

¹ I have references to the genealogy of the Baker family of Westthorp, in *Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and Natural History (Proceedings)*, VIII, 129, and Add. MS 19116; but I have not been able to consult them.

² *Cal. Pat. Rolls* (1422-29), p. 446.

³ *Ibid.* (1429-36), p. 385.

⁴ *Ibid.* (1422-29), p. 366.

⁵ B. Burke, *The Landed Gentry of Great Britain* (1906), p. 764.

⁶ F. Blomefield, *History of Norfolk*, VI, 220.

new church and steeple. Blomefield says that the new church was begun in the time of John Botewright, rector, but was not completed till the reign of Henry VII, and the tower at the west end was not finished till 1510.¹ As Botewright was not rector after 1474,² the time of building was from before 1474 to 1510. The steeple was begun in 1507.³ In the group of names which includes that of Hamond are the names of John Angere, parson of Southacre, who paid for the glasoning of a window in the new church, and of Robert Copping, "late Parson of this Chirche" (i.e., Swaffham), who gave money for building the steeple. John Angere was rector of Southacre from 1452 to 1486.⁴ Copping succeeded Botewright as rector at Swaffham; and if Blomefield's list of rectors (p. 223) is complete he held this position from 1474 to 1495. From the data at hand we cannot get a more exact date than the last quarter of the fifteenth century for the entry concerning Raffe Hamond. Either he or his father is probably the Hamond of the play, if Dr. Furnivall is right in identifying Soffeham with the Norfolk Swaffham. As we shall see, however, it is by no means certain that this identification is correct.

Wylliam Thurlay of Hauston.—I have found nothing definite about the other men named in the play. The "Johannes Thyrlowe de Hawkeston," who is mentioned in the accounts of the Priory of St. Radegund, Cambridge, for 1450-51,⁵ may, however, be one of the family of Wylliam Thurlay of Hauston in l. 499 of the play. Hawkeston and Hauston are variant spellings for the modern Hauxton.

William Fyde(?).—In l. 496 of the play, there is, perhaps, the name of another man of the neighborhood. Dr. Furnivall's reading for this line is, "Take W[illiam] Fyde, yf ȝe wyll haue ony mo"; Professor Manly reads, "Take w[ith] yow Fyde," etc. In this connection it is worth noting that in 1450-51 a John Fyde lived in Waterbeach, a town situated about five miles northeast by north from Cambridge, in the vicinity where the play was given.⁶

¹ *Ibid.*, 216.² *Ibid.*, 223.³ *Ibid.*, 208.⁴ *Ibid.*, 85.⁵ Arthur Gray, *The Priory of Saint Radegund, Cambridge*, in *Cambridge Antiquarian Society, Octavo Series*, 1898, p. 163. These are the accounts that furnished most of our information concerning Pychard of Trumpington.⁶ Arthur Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

MISCELLANEOUS PASSAGES

In ll. 32-36, Christ is likened to the head and his saints to the members of the human body:

Se how þe hede, þe members dayly do magnyfe.
 Who ys þe hede, forsoth I xall yow certyfy;e;
 I mene owur Sauyowur, þat was lykynnyde to a lambe;
 Ande hys sayntis be þe members þat dayly he doth satysfy
 With þe precyose reuer þat runnyth from hys wombe.

This comparison, which occurs in several places in the Bible, is a favorite one with mediaeval writers. Cf. *Ayenbite of Inwyt*:

Be zeuende scele is uor þet we byeþ alle lemes of one bodye. huerof Iesu crist is þet heued / and we byeþ þe lemes. þet we libbeþ alle of onelepi mete. Þet is of þe holy uless and of þe holy blod of Iesu crist þet ous zuo moche loueþ / and zuo moche halt ous worþ: þet he ous yefþ his blod to drinke / and his uless to etene.¹

Walter Hilton in his *Epistle on Mixed Life* elaborates the idea of the members:

Thou sall vndirstande þat oure lorde Ihesu Criste, as mane, es heuede of a gastely body, whilke es haly kirke. The membris of this body are all cristene mene. Some are armes, and some are fete, and some ere oþer membris aftire sundre wirkynges þat þay vse in thaire lyffynge.²

William of Shoreham adds a new comparison, of the priest with the mouth:

Crist hys þat heued, þe prest þe mouþe,
 Be lymes þat folke i-vere.³

In l. 47, Myscheff remarks to Mercy:

Yowur wytt ys lytyll, yowur hede ys mekyll.

The proverb "A great head and a little wit" is recorded in Ray's collection.⁴ In the modern mumming plays, the Fool, Beelzebub, or some other character often enters with:

Here come I; ain't been yit,
 Big head and little wit.⁵

In ll. 49-52, Myscheff asks Mercy "pis questyon to claryfye":

Dryff-draff, mysse-masche;
 Sume was corn, & sume was chaffe;
 My dame seyde my name was Raff;
 On-schett yowur lokke, & take an halpenye.

¹ *Dan Michel's Ayenbite of Inwyt*, ed. R. Morris (E. E. T. S.), p. 146.

C. Horstmann, *Richard Rolle of Hampole*, I, 272.

² *The Poems of William of Shoreham*, ed. M. Konrath (E. E. T. S.), p. 23, ll. 622-23.

⁴ J. Ray, *A Collection of English Proverbs* (1742), p. 117.

⁵ E. K. Chambers, *The Mediaeval Stage*, I, 215.

The third line contains a pun on the words "Ralph" (M. E. Raffe) and "raff." The *New English Dictionary* defines the latter as "worthless material, trash, refuse," and gives a quotation from *Palladius on Husbandrie* (ca. 1420), I, 827: "Take chaf & raf [L. *purgamenta*] And ley hit on thy lond. . . . And when thou sist the myst, let brenne vp chaf and raf." No doubt the words "chaf" and "raf" were frequently used together as in this passage from *Palladius*, and thus furnished a ready-made rhyme for the writer of *Mankind*. He, of course, uses "raff" in its most uncomplimentary sense. The passage in the play may have been written merely as a bit of doggerel rhyme, with no intention of giving it a logical meaning; it also suggests, however, a more definite idea. Mercy has previously said (l. 43) that at the Last Judgment there will be a strict examination of the human race, and a separation of the corn from the chaff. Thereupon Myscheff compares humanity to a misch-masch, a hotch-potch, of the good and the bad, the corn and the chaff. His wife, without waiting for the Last Verdict, has placed him among the chaff, or more specifically, the "raff."

In the expression, "On-schett yowur lokke" (l. 52), the same figure is used for "to talk, to speak" as in ll. 128-29:

Now opyn yowur sachell with Laten wordis,
Ande sey me þis in clerycall manere!

Cf. the common Old English expression "Word-hord onleac," as in *Beowulf*, l. 259, etc.

In ll. 72-73, New-gyse(?) directs the minstrels to play, and urges them to "ley on with pi ballys tyll hys bely breste." "Ballys" is not, I think, from O.F. *bal*, a dance, as Dr. Brandl suggests,¹ but is a form for "bellows" used here as a slang term for the bagpipe for the sake of the pun with "bely."² I have found no instance in which this instrument is specifically called a "bellows," but the comparison is a natural and obvious one. The word "bely" may either be a slang term for the bag of the pipe (another obvious comparison, as may be seen in the pictures of fourteenth century

¹ A. Brandl, *Quellen des weltlichen Dramas in England vor Shakespeare*, p. 652.

² According to the *New English Dictionary*, s.v. "belly," in early Middle English the form "ball" was used only for "belly," and the form "bell" for either "bellows" or "belly." However, "bales," with an *a*, is given for "bellows" in an entry dated 1523, s.v. "bellows."

bagpipes),¹ or may refer to the belly of Nought, who is to do the dancing, or the difficult part of it. The line thus means either "Blow till your bagpipe bursts," or "Play till the dancer's belly bursts." Either meaning would fit the context.

The dance that follows is a lively one. Now-a-days, New-gyse, and Nought all take part, but Nought has the most difficult rôle. He twice expresses the fear that he will break his neck, and after he has finished he declares that the place for dancing is a "narrow space." His performance was probably in the nature of an acrobatic exhibition, perhaps a rope dance. Dancing on a rope was, according to Strutt, a part of the entertainment given by minstrels and jocolators as far back as the thirteenth century.²

L. 88, "A-non, of with yowur clothes, yf 3e wyll pray," seems to have no meaning. Is "pray" a scribal error for "play"? The latter word makes good sense: Nought is trying to persuade Mercy to dance. A manuscript *l*, if carelessly extended below the line, could easily be taken for an *r*; see the facsimile of the text.

In ll. 149-52, just before leaving the stage Now-a-days says:

Cum wynde, cum reyn,
Thow I cumme neuer a-geyn!
þe deull put out both yowur eyen!
Felouse, go we hens tyght!

An expression similar to the one in the first two lines occurs also in connection with an exit in *Mundus et Infans*, l. 491. Conscience has been preaching to Manhode much as Mercy has been doing to the three scapegraces in *Mankind*; and as Conscience leaves Manhode says:

Yes, yes! Ye, come wynde and rayne,
God let hym neuer come here agayne!

That is to say: "Let wind, rain, and other discomforts come, if they must, but let me never meet this man again." In our play Now-a-days ironically gives expression to the thought that he knows is in Mercy's mind.

W. K. SMART

ARMOUR INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

[To be continued]

¹ Two pictures are given in F. W. Galpin, *Old English Instruments of Music*, p. 176.

² J. Strutt, *Sports and Pastimes of the People of England*, p. 302 (Chatto and Windus, 1898).

REVIEWS AND NOTICES

The Life and Romances of Mrs. Eliza Haywood. By GEORGE FRISBIE
WHICHER. New York: Columbia University Press. 1915.

A study of the life and romances of Mrs. Eliza Haywood has been added to the list of Columbia dissertations in English and Comparative Literature. As in the others dealing with eighteenth-century themes, Professor Trent has aided in the production of a well-planned and definite account of a minor literary figure. The author has not tried to raise his "scribbling authoress" to a higher rank than she deserves; he has merely recorded the facts, with some incidental comment upon the change in subject-matter caused by current events and by Mrs. Haywood's gradual loss of vigor. His portrait of this "she romp," a "hen" that "refused to set," might be considered as corollary to Professor Rémond's distinguished essay on "The Sexual Correlations of Poetic Genius," for Mr. Whicher's amusing asides upon his author's tributes to Minerva and Venus prove his trust in the latter goddess as an aid to literary endeavor.

Detailed examination of the various chapters convinces one that the first half of this study is much the better. Only in the biographical investigation ought one to feel dissatisfied with the content of the first ninety pages. To be sure, nothing is more shadowy than the life-records of obscure writers; yet it is from these special studies that one expects to glean new data. It is difficult to accept as final the failure to find new evidence on the date of Mrs. Haywood's death. Even though "the usual magazines" of the day seem, as is said, to make no mention of the occurrence, further research might prove more fruitful. Parish records and the obscure news journals might add still more to the valuable evidence that Mr. Whicher has unearthed from such sources regarding her birth and unfortunate marriage. A rapid scanning of the Historical Manuscripts Commission Reports reveals¹ a congratulatory letter from Mrs. Haywood to the Countess of Oxford. Though merely a flattering accompaniment to a presentation copy of her *La Belle Assemblée*, its relation to the full biographical record might have been useful. The two succeeding chapters, however, are most satisfying. The source studies and summaries of the "short romances of passion" are clear and convincing, so that one readily agrees with Mr. Whicher in attributing to their author a romantic treatment of love suggestive of Richardson's more accomplished productions. Some clear derivatives of Restoration comedy are also pointed out in the characters of Mrs. Haywood's novels

¹ *Portland MSS.*, VI, 21.

from 1720 until the appearance of her "secret histories and scandal novels" of the thirties.

A chapter on the Duncan Campbell pamphlets uses the traditional statement that Defoe, William Bond, or Mrs. Haywood was responsible for them. To this weak argument are added excellent proofs of her share in the later ones. The last pages of this chapter show acuteness in drawing conclusions, and with the survey of the earlier romances they form a worthy contribution to literary history.

In the following chapters difficulty arises from an attempt to attach motives to satirical portraits of which in some cases even the authorship is in question. One needs a divining-rod to explain the inconsistencies of eighteenth-century fiction in its satirical phases, for authentic evidence of intent is usually not available. One cannot safely credit any statement in an isolated work, for a correlation with contemporary events may completely alter the evidence. Of such conclusions in Mr. Whicher's study, the most dubious is that regarding Swift's dislike of Mrs. Haywood as expressed in a letter to the Countess of Suffolk. Presumably this statement, dated October 26, 1731, was to please the King's mistress by a slur on the authoress who, four years earlier, had made the royal amours a subject of satire. Actually, however, the letter was insincere, for the Countess was not then "the friend of Swift." On June 29 of that year he had described her to Gay in her true colors—as one who had cheated them all. Moreover, at the coronation of George II in 1727 Swift lost his chief ground of interest in the Countess of Suffolk and her mistress; he knew that his hopes of favor through their agency were futile.

Similar criticism might be made upon a use of quotations from Lord Chesterfield and Lord Hervey to prove that writers "were ready to seize upon any pretext" for attacking Robert Walpole, who "had never shown himself a friend to letters." Chesterfield was an open partisan of Prince Frederick, and more politician than writer; he had no reason to seek favor with George II or his minister. Lord Hervey, it is true, had once been hostile to Walpole; but after obtaining, in 1727, a thousand-pound pension from that political overlord, he turned a facile pen to the service of the crown. To quote Hervey's statement of the Queen's comment on Walpole's private life, is of no consequence; she herself was the chief instrument of the minister's power over the King, and their feeling toward one another in 1735 was entirely friendly. The excess of satire directed at Walpole from 1721 to 1742 had no source in his presumed indifference to men of letters, nor was he heedless of criticism. Of this Mr. Whicher gives indirect suggestion in showing that after publishing in 1736 her *Adventures of Eovaai*, a satire on Walpole, Mrs. Haywood wrote nothing more for six years; then too, only once thereafter, during twenty odd years, would she permit her name to appear on a title-page.

Turning from such incomplete proofs of motive for these works of the middle period, one finds many stimulating comments upon the writings attributed to Mrs. Haywood's declining years. Appreciative, but cautious, estimates are offered of her share in the *Spectator* tradition, of her contribution to the foundling literature preceding *Tom Jones*, and of her part in forming the English domestic novel. The study closes with a concrete statement of conclusions. The author thereupon bids farewell to this daughter of Venus and sister of Minerva. Having written "the obituary of her works," if nothing more, he rests content. Toilsome research among these heaps of "perishable literature" could not dull either his sense of humor or his appreciation of literary values.

DAVID HARRISON STEVENS

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Chaucer and His Poetry. By GEORGE LYMAN KITTREDGE. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1915.

This volume consists in the main of a series of brilliant and sometimes highly ingenious interpretations of certain representative works of Chaucer. Coming from the pen of such a keen and original student of Chaucer as Professor Kittredge, whose reading and comprehension of the poet's work are illumined by a knowledge of mediaeval life and literary art almost unsurpassed, the book is naturally not a labored, documented manual, intended primarily to familiarize comparatively elementary students with a summary of preceding investigation. It is, on the contrary, a series of highly original contributions, depending, to some extent, on the researches of the author's predecessors, but interpreting many things entirely anew, and emphasizing the importance and significance of much that has hitherto been neglected or overlooked.

In chap. i, on "The Man and His Times," Professor Kittredge, under the guise of attacking and disposing of certain current misapprehensions concerning Chaucer and the fourteenth century, manages to call the attention of the general reader to much knowledge that will be new to him, or at least that has hitherto been ignored in its bearing on the activities of the poet. He properly objects to the smug characterization of the Middle Ages, and especially of the fourteenth century, as credulous and blindly submissive to authority, as slavish to the deductive method and ignorant of the inductive method. He objects to the conventionally taught theory that mediaeval writers were unrestrained by the laws and precepts of literary art, and as a result produced work lacking in proportion or plan. He holds (in conformity with his later and fuller treatment of the *Canterbury Tales*) that many of the so-called digressions of Chaucer are due to the inherently "dramatic" character of the tales, and are motivated by the character or the

purpose of the narrator or by the situation. He reinterprets the trite division of Chaucer's career into French, Italian, and English periods, pointing out that it is true that in the first period the poet was a typical French love poet writing in the English language, but that the Italian period was one of intellectual and artistic emancipation and emulation; while the English period was English not because of submission to English fashions or because of inspiration drawn from English authors, but because Chaucer was dealing with English subject-matter. Further, he points out how this pat little analysis, as generally taught, overlooks the fact that Chaucer carried with him into the later periods all the equipment and technique that he had previously acquired. Finally, he inserts a fourth period, one of transition between the French and the Italian. The chapter closes with an attempt to show what glimpses we may catch of Chaucer the man from the few authentic personal references that exist in his poems.

The structure of the remainder of the book follows the division of Chaucer's literary career into four periods. One work illustrative of each is fully discussed—the *Book of the Duchess* for the French, the *House of Fame* for the Transition, *Troilus* for the Italian, and the *Canterbury Tales* for the English. Everywhere we meet fresh interpretations, new material, revelations from hitherto unattained points of view. Again and again we find Professor Kittredge proceeding on the certainty never before so concisely and directly phrased as on p. 151: "*Chaucer always knew what he was about.*" He holds false the charge that Chaucer was guilty of bad art because of lack of control over method, intention, or material. He believes the evident *naïveté* of the *Book of the Duchess*, for example, is not Chaucer's, but that of the dreamer, a fictitious character, whom the poet has deliberately drawn as *naïf* because that suits the artistry of the plan (cf. pp. 45, 50-53).

It is in this chapter also that we find (pp. 54-68) the prettiest utilization possible of a considerable amount of work on sources by preceding students. Mere source hunters have received their share of opprobrium, but here we see their results properly appreciated by a master. The labor of a source hunter is not finished when he has indicated an indebtedness. The important point always is: How did the author use or modify the structure or the material which he borrowed? How did these affect his art? How thoroughly has he assimilated and mastered his borrowings? How intensely has he visualized and vitalized them in his own treatment? In short, how do the differences between source and writer exhibit the power of the latter? This Professor Kittredge has shown here, and in his study of the *Troilus* and elsewhere. Indeed, this is one of the most noteworthy features of the book.

By calling attention to the fact that the *Troilus* is "an elaborate psychological novel," "a tragedy of character," composed with full regard to

the system of courtly love; by interpreting the poem and the characters in the light of his comprehension of mediaeval thought, Professor Kittredge has not only clarified and enriched our understanding of the poem, but he has given us a model for the treatment of similar problems.

In his treatment of the *Canterbury Tales*, his most important contribution consists in the attention that he has given to the links and the narrators. As we should expect from the author of "Chaucer's Discussion of Marriage" (*Modern Philology*, IX, 435 ff.), his thesis is that by treating each tale as a separate literary unit, we have failed to recognize much that is pertinent and pregnant in Chaucer's literary art. The poet did not merely put the tales into the mouths of the pilgrims—on the contrary, he motivated the tales by the situations, by the interplay of personality, and by the characters of the tellers, sometimes correlating a whole group of stories through the recurring discussion of one striking theme.

In this connection, however, it might be well to call attention to the danger that lies in the frequent use of the terms "dramatic," and "drama." While the *Canterbury Tales* are "dramatic" in the looser sense of the term, they are not "drama." (Drama as a form comprises dialogue, impersonation, and action, with no narrative or description by the author save in stage directions.) Of course Professor Kittredge would be the last person in the world to think of the *Canterbury Tales* as anything but narrative, however vigorous the action, conversation, and characterization may be; but is there not some danger that a few of his less careful readers may here find a suggestion that will result in their adding to the already sufficient body of loose thinking about the mediaeval drama?

With regard to Professor Kittredge's interpretation of the Marriage Group, he has of course argued his case ingeniously and cogently, and his belief has received wide acceptance. At the same time it is only fair to observe that a certain amount of caution ought to govern the interpreter when he begins to see more than immediately meets the eye. Especially is this caution necessary when other students, applying the same methods, begin (as they have begun) to extend the group until it threatens to include practically all the tales, with almost as great a show of validity to their arguments as to those of Professor Kittredge.

There is naturally opportunity for discussion of some of the author's views. Professor Manly's judgment concerning the badly proportioned *House of Fame* and the digression in *Troilus* (Kittredge *Anniversary Papers*, pp. 76-77) should be compared with Kittredge, p. 115. There is also room for diversity of opinion as to the length and nature of the conclusion of the *House of Fame* (cf. Kittredge, p. 103, with Manly, p. 81).

It is unfortunate that Chaucer should be alluded to as a "collector" (pp. 30, 45) and an "ambassador" (p. 6). Chaucer was a controller of the customs, not a collector. His duties as controller were merely to supervise

and check the collectors (cf. Hulbert, *Chaucer's Official Life*, p. 42). Nor can such foreign errands as Chaucer went on, or the manner of his going, entitle him to rank as an ambassador. Either he was attached in a subordinate capacity to the train of some important person, or the mission was such as scarcely to call for the application of any such title (as when, for instance, he went to Genoa to negotiate for the establishment of a Genoese mercantile factory in an English port).

The imaginary "command" from John of Gaunt that Chaucer write the *Book of the Duchess* (p. 37) is also unfortunate in that, occurring in a book by so authoritative a writer as this, it is highly likely to give the impression that the suggestion is far more authoritative than it is; the "request" or "command" is of course a fanciful surmise. Chaucer may very well have written the poem entirely on his own initiative. That the connection between Chaucer and John of Gaunt was far less intimate and far less influential on the career of Chaucer than has generally been supposed, has been shown by Dr. Hulbert.

While Professor Kittredge does not discuss the chronology of Chaucer's poems, his implication is that the group of problems involved has been practically settled. Perhaps to question the conventional Chaucerian chronology may subject the questioner to a charge of undue skepticism. Nevertheless it ought to be strongly emphasized that most of the conventional chronology rests on no more than speculation and surmise. A cautious examination of all the evidence yet adduced reveals many a tenuous hypothesis, such as that Chaucer was too busy at a certain period to have finished a certain work by a certain date; such as a "feeling" that one work is "better" or more mature than another, and is therefore later; or such a questionable identification as that of the *Parliament of Fowls* as an occasional poem on Richard II's marriage (cf. Manly, *Festschrift für Lorenz Morsbach* [*Studien zur Englischen Philologie*, I], pp. 279-87).

While it is a sheer delight to have such a book as this unencumbered with footnotes, occasionally the author's allusiveness leaves something to be desired. For example, the reference to Sercambi's *Novelle* (p. 149) is not sufficiently definite to be explicable to a student or teacher far removed from sources of bibliographical information (Karl Young, "The Plan of the *Canterbury Tales*," *Kittredge Anniversary Papers*, pp. 405-17).

The book's style is incomparable. It rings with the forthright positiveness of the author, and sparkles with the incisive phrases that his students know so well.

THOMAS A. KNOTT

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

